JOINT USI-CMSR SEMINAR

(S-32)



ESTABLISHED 1870

REGIONAL SECURITY PERSPECTIVE, MILITARY COOPERATION, INTERNATIONAL SECURITY MECHANISMS AND FUTURE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

PROCEEDINGS OF JOINT USI-CMSR SEMINAR

HELD AT USI, NEW DELHI ON

18-19 MAY, 2004

First Session

Regional Security Perspective

Talk

Impact of Terrorism and Countermeasures by Maj Gen Ostankov Vladimir Ivanovich

Second Session

The Scope for increased Military to Military Cooperation between India and Russia to include International Peacekeeping Operations

Third Session

The Current Crisis in the International Collective Security Mechanisms and the Future of the United Nations

- Chairman
 Shri K Subrahmanyam, IAS (Retd)
- Chairman
 Lt Gen VK Sood, PVSM, AVSM (Retd)
- Chairman
 Maj Gen Ostankov Vladimir Ivanovich
- Chairman
 Lt Gen Satish Nambiar, PVSM, AVSM, VrC (Retd)

All rights reserved. No part of this paper/proceedings may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photo-copying, recording or by any information storage and retrieval system without permission in writing from the Institution

UNITED SERVICE INSTITUTION OF INDIA

Rao Tula Ram Marg, Vasant Vihar, New Delhi-110057

Published by UNITED SERVICE INSTITUTION OF INDIA © New Delhi, 2004

Deputy Director and Editor:

Major General Y K Gera (Retd)

Copies of this publication may be obtained from the Publication Officer, USI, Rao Tula Ram Marg (Opposite Signals Enclave), Post Box No. 8 Vasant Vihar PO, New Delhi-110 057

Price: Rs. 100.00

CONTENTS

Welcome Address	Lt Gen Satish Nambiar, PVSM, AVSM, VrC (Retd)	3
Introductory Remarks	Maj Gen Ostankov Vladímir Ivanovich	4
Inaugural Address	Vice Adm Raman Puri, PVSM, AVSM, VSM, ADC	5
First Session –	Regional Security Perspective	
Chairman	Shri K Subrahmanyam, IAS (Retd)	11
First Paper	Lt Gen Klimenko Anatoly Filippovich (Retd)	12
Second Paper	Lt Gen VK Kapoor, PVSM (Retd)	17
General Discussion		26
Talk –	Impact of Terrorism and Countermeasures By Maj Gen Ostankov Vladmir Ivanovich	34
Chairman	Lt Gen VK Sood, PVSM, AVSM (Retd)	
General Discussion		42
Second Session –	The Scope for increased Military to Military Cooperation be India and Russia to include International Peacekeeping Ope	etween erations
Chairman	Maj Gen Ostankov Vladimir Ivanovich	45
First Paper	Lt Gen VK Singh, PVSM (Retd)	46
Second Paper	Col Kovtunenko Mikhail Yurievich	51
General Discussion		56
Third Session –	The Current Crisis in the International Collective Security M and the Future of the United Nations	echanisms
Chairman	Lt Gen Satish Nambiar, PVSM, AVSM, VrC (Retd)	59
First Paper	Col Kondaratskov Igor Petrovich	60
Second Paper	Air Mshl Vinod Patney, SYSM, PVSM, AVSM, VrC (Retd)	62
General Discussion		66
Closing Remarks	Maj Gen Ostankov Vladimir Ivanovich Chief of the CMSR	71
	Lt Gen Satish Nambiar, PVSM, AVSM, VrC (Retd) Director, USI	71

THE PARTICIPANTS

USI Participants

Lieutenant General Satish Nambiar, PVSM, AVSM, VrC (Retd) is a graduate of the Australian Staff College. He has held command, instructional and general staff appointments at various levels, including that of the Director General of Military Operations. He was a member of an Indian Army Training team in Iraq from July 1977 to January 1979 and Military Adviser at the High Commission of India in London from December 1983 to November 1987. As the first Force Commander and Head of Mission, he set up the United Nations operations in the former Yugoslavia (UNPROFOR) and commanded it from 03 March 1992 to 02 March 1993. He retired as the Deputy Chief of the Army Staff in August 1994. Since July 1996, he is the Director of the United Service Institution of India. In November 2003, he has been nominated by the Secretary General of the United Nations, to serve on a high-level panel, referred to as the 'Blue Ribbon Panel', on global security threats and reform of the international system.

Lieutenant General V K Singh, PVSM (Retd) was commissioned in the Madras Regiment on 11 December 1955. He is a graduate of the Defence Services Staff College and the National Defence College. Among major command and staff appointments that he has held during his service were, command of an infantry battalion during the 1971 operations, an infantry brigade in the Western Sector, an infantry division in the Southern Sector and a corp in the Central Sector. He has been Brigadier-in-Charge Administration of a corps. Additional Director General Perspective Planning and Director General Military Operations at Army Headquarters. He retired on 31 March 1994 from the appointment of Military Secretary Army Headquarters.

Lieutenant General V K Kapoor, PVSM (Retd) is from the Armoured Corps. He commanded an Armoured Division. He has been Deputy Director General in the Directorate of Military Operations at Army HQ, and an instructor at the Defence Services Staff College (DSSC) and the College of Combat (since named Army War College), Mhow. Prior to his retirement in March 2003, he was the Commandant of the Army War College.

Lieutenant General VK Sood, PVSM, AVSM (Retd) was commissioned in December 1953 in the DOGRA Regiment. A graduate from the Defence Services Staff College (DSSC), Wellington. He did his Royal College of Defence Studies (RCDS) Course in 1980. He was promoted to the rank of Lieutenant General in the year 1985. He commanded a corp in the Western theatre and held the appointment of the Vice Chief of the Army Staff during the period 1989 to 1992. He has done his Ph D. His area of specialisation is geo-political approach to the North Eastern States with particular interest in the states of Nagaland and Manipur.

Vice Admiral Raman Puri, PVSM, AVSM, VSM, ADC was commissioned in the Indian Navy on 01 January 1966. He is a Missile and Gunnery specialist who has commanded a number of ships including INS Vikrant. A product of Defence Services Staff College, Wellington; Command and General Staff College (erstwhile, USSR) and the National Defence College, New Delhi, he has been the Deputy Chief of the Naval Staff and Flag Officer Commanding in Chief Eastern Naval Command. He has an abiding interest in national security, international relations and

science and technology policy issues. At present, he is the Chief of Integrated Defence Staff (CIDS) to Chairman, Chiefs of Staff Committee (COSC). He is the Founder Director of College of Naval Warfare.

Air Marshal Vinod Patney, SYSM, PVSM, AVSM, VrC (Retd) was commissioned in May 1961 in the flying branch of the Indian Air Force as a Fighter Pilot. He has flown numerous fighter aircraft including Sukhois and Jaguars. He took part in 1965 and 1971 operations. He has been Chief Operations Officer and Base Commander of Jaquar Air Base. He has held important assignments such as, Senior Air Staff Officer (SASO) Headquarters Western Air Command, Air-Officer-Commanding in Chief Central Air Command and Air Officer Commanding in Chief Western Air Command. During his tenure as AOC-in-C Western Air Command, he was responsible for air operations during Kargil operations in 1999. He retired as the Vice Chief of the Air Staff after 40 years of distinguished service. He is interested in issues dealing with air power, security and international relations.

Shri K Subrahmanyam joined the Indian Administrative Service (IAS) in 1951. He served in a number of appointments within the country and also in the UN. He was the Director of the Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses (IDSA) from 1968 to 1975 and for a second tenure from 1980 to 1987. He was Convenor of the National Security Advisory Board from 1998 to 2000. He chaired the Kargil Review Panel in 1999. He is associated with a number of universities and is also consultant editor to influential print media. He has authored and edited 14 books.

Guest Participants

Lieutenant General Klimenko Anatoly Filippovic (Retd) was born on 08 March 1946. He is a Chief Scientific Researcher of military security for the Centre for Military and Strategic Research of Russian Armed Forces since 1986. He had studied in Military Academy of the Armoured Troops. During his military service he held various command and staff appointments.

Major General Ostankov Vladimir Ivanovich was born on 15 March 1951. He is serving in the Armed Forces since 1968. He is the Chief of the Centre for Military and Strategic Research of the Russian Armed Forces since 1995. A Graduate of Military and Engineers Academy. He is a PhD in Military Science. During his service he has held various command and staff appointments.

Colonel Kovtunenko Mikhail Yuriyevich was born on 29 July 1963. He is serving in Armed Forces since 1980. He is Senior Research Scholar of the military security problems and a member of the Centre of Military and Strategic Research of the Russian Armed Forces. He has studied in Humanitarian Academy of the Russian Federation, Armed Forces. During his military service he has held various command and staff appointments.

Colonel Kondaratskov Igor Petrovich was born on 10 December 1961. He is serving in the Armed Forces since 1979 and presently serving with Foreign Relations Department, Ministry of Defence, Russian Federation. He has studied in Higher Military Engineering College for Radio Electronics. During his military service he has held various command and staff appointments.

WELCOME ADDRESS LIEUTENANT GENERAL SATISH NAMBIAR, PVSM, AVSM, VrC (RETD) DIRECTOR USI

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS MAJOR GENERAL OSTANKOV VLADIMIR IVANOVICH CHIEF OF THE CMSR OF THE RUSSIAN ARMED FORCES

INAUGURAL ADDRESS

VICE ADMIRAL RAMAN PURI, PVSM, AVSM, VSM, ADC
CHIEF OF INTEGRATED DEFENCE STAFF TO
CHAIRMAN CHIEFS OF STAFF COMMITTEE (COSC)
AND PRESIDENT USI COUNCIL

WELCOME ADDRESS

LIEUTENANT GENERAL SATISH NAMBIAR, PVSM, AVSM, VrC (RETD)

It is my proud privilege to welcome all of you to this seminar hosted by the United Service Institution of India with the Centre for Military and Strategic Studies of the Russian Armed Forces.

This is the outcome of the efforts over the last few years to initiate a dialogue with a strategic institution in Russia; a country with whom India has had strong, friendly and traditional links.

I would like to extend a warm welcome to General Ostankov and his colleagues. Of course they are probably already feeling the heat of our welcome given the high temperatures in Delhi.

We hope this will be the beginning of a sustained interaction and dialogue between the two institutions to our mutual benefit. There is much we need to discuss together in context of the international situation because many of the vital issues concern both countries intimately. Terrorism,

proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) particularly with non-state actors, dominance of the international arena by the USA, unilateralism, marginalisation of the United Nations and so on.

We shall no doubt be sharing views on these and related topics over the next two days.

I am grateful to the President of the USI, Vice Admiral Raman Puri, the Chief of the Integrated Defence Staff for sparing the time from his busy schedule to be with us this morning and deliver the inaugural address at the seminar. It is a reflection of his personal commitment and that of the Indian Armed Forces to Indo-Russian cooperation and understanding, as also to the USI. I am grateful to our members who have found time to participate.

Before I request Vice Admiral Puri to deliver the inaugural address may I request the leader of the Russian delegation, General Ostankov to say a few words.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

MAJOR GENERAL OSTANKOV VLADIMIR IVANOVICH

Dear General Nambiar and colleagues,

Let me greet participants of today's seminar. In this seminar, we are going to share our views on global and regional security perspectives, international terrorism and also various aspects of Indo-Russian military and scientific cooperation.

First of all, let me thank the organisers of the seminar for their invitation, initiative and also the contents and relevant subjects selected for the seminar. This interaction between our institutes is taking place for the first time. Hope this will be the beginning of an enduring and fruitful cooperation between the military-scientific organisations of Russia and India. Over many decades, the cooperation between India and the Russian Federation has been developing in a stable and dynamic way. Important matters in the spheres of economic, political, humanitarian and military cooperation have been solved efficiently. Between us partnership relationship has been established. The feature of this relationship is stability, openess and mutual trust. This cooperation including cooperation in the new military sphere, first of all, has been a result of close views of the leadership of our countries on the problems of global and regional security. Close interests of the countries in the general balance of power in the fight against international terrorism and participation of the Armed Forces in peacekeeping operations has also been taken into consideration. High level of cooperation has deep and objective reasons related not only to the active interaction of the neighbouring and adjacent regions but also the commonality of historical and spiritual values of our two largest Eurasian nations

Let me introduce the participants of the Russian delegations who are:-

- (a) Lieutenant General Klimenko Anatoly Filippovich (Retd).
- (b) Colonel Michael Yureivch.
- (c) Colonel Igor Petrovich.

We also have Major General Victor N Chernov, Defence Attache and his colleagues from the Russian embassy.

Gentlemen, in this seminar we will be able to exchange views on a wide range of problems related to various aspects of global and regional security, counter terrorism, peacekeeping operations under regional arrangements and also under the UN.

Let me wish all participants of the seminar fruitful work and good results. Thank you.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS

VICE ADMIRAL RAMAN PURI, PVSM, AVSM, VSM, ADC

General

From the turn of this century, events unfolding in Southern Asia have turned the global attention on this region. Kargil, 11 September 2001 and Afghanistan, Parakram, Second Gulf War and now nuclear proliferation activities of Pakistan, Iran, North Korea and China, all have their roots in our region. Even in previous decade, proxy war launched by Pakistan kept the region volatile. Looking back another decade brings out that the US sponsored and Pakistan-Taliban executed proxy war against erstwhile Soviet Union in Afghanistan was also fought in this region. Thus the image of Southern Asia as a protracted conflict ridden region characterised by the incessant meddling by major powers is a reality.

The region is surrounded by a number of nuclear and missile powers including those with aspirations to acquire them in the future. In addition, extra-regional powers will continue to remain active in pursuance of their perceived national interests.

Security Challenges

The security dynamics of Central Asia continue to be in a state of flux and are getting increasingly exacerbated by perceptional interests of regional and stakes of extra regional players.

Central Asian Republics (CAR) have emerged as a strategically important region because of their strategic location, dynamics of ethnic composition, religious activism and vast reserves of natural resources. The region has, therefore, become the centre of contemporary geo-political and geo-economic competition for all major global powers.

The path of economic reconstruction and socio-political consolidation that the republics have charted is, undoubtedly, not free of hurdles and a lot of intra as well as inter republic problems persist. There are sociopolitical impediments to good governance, leading to repression and authoritarianism; democratic institutions are weak; challenges of religious fundamentalism and ethnic diversity transcend all borders; poor state of economies has resulted in increased poverty, unemployment and resultant frustration. The combination of all these factors is a sure recipe for strife, confusion and instability. It is, however, in the interest of the international community that CAR remain stable, democratic and secular through a system of constructive engagement of the region by global as well as regional powers.

The speed, with which independence came to CAR, gave no time to their leaders to formulate policies towards their neighbours as also the other powers. Thus, their relations with the rest of the world were dominated not so much by what they wanted but by what the rest of the world wished to do with Central Asia. Thereafter, the region caught the attention of all major powers and economic giants to engage in economic activity with a view to extend their control over the vast natural resources.

Central Asia may be considered as a zone of convergence of the major geo-cultural regions of Eurasia with its security spanning both the continents. Though land-locked, the region is a potential linchpin and gateway to

West Asia, East Asia, South Asia and Russia. Revival of the old 'Silk Route' and the proposed gas and oil pipelines add to the strategic importance of the region.

Another important factor is its location next to what may be termed as the geostrategic melting pot - West Asia and Afghanistan. It is also the underbelly of the Russian landmass. In the game plan to extend North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) to the doorsteps of the neighbouring countries, this area has a crucial role to play. The region also provides a strategic pivot to the USA and NATO vis a vis China.

In additions to the above, is the facet of the potential of intense energy competition leading to conflicts and violent upheavals in the region. In the post-cold war period, large proportions of conventional conflicts have centred around the oil-producing regions of the Middle East. The Gulf War in the region is another example of a conflict caused due to competition for resources. Central Asia today is major source of untapped hydrocarbon reserves in the world. A sudden change in regime in such a resource-rich area can lead to major cataclysmic events and will have great implications in Southern Asia.

Security Perspective - Southern Asia

The inter-state competition is primarily for political and ideological dominance or geostrategic gains, territory, economic benefits and resources. In Southern Asia proxy war and trans-border terrorism launched by Pakistan has pitted the two neighbours against each other. Moreover, quoting an American scholar, "Pakistan is potentially a collapsing state and a sanctuary for terrorists". Consequently, it is generally perceived that deterrence breakdown between India and Pakistan represents a possibility with serious

consequences. Recognising this reality, the Government of India has taken the sagacious decision to initiate dialogue with Pakistan despite the proxy war.

The issue of regional stability is equally important due to power transitions taking place in the region. India is poised for rapid progress. Unless all the nations of the region join the march to peace and prosperity, there can be setbacks.

Globalisation has presented all countries in Southern Asia with not only huge opportunities but also serious challenges. The success of globalisation would be its 'inclusiveness' - what it does to improve the plight of the poor in the developing countries. The Asian region is a dominant region in the flux with a large number of developing countries - thus emerging as the global centre of gravity. It is assessed generally that the US power will remain unparalleled in the short to medium term as it retains its presence in Central Asia, Asia-Pacific region and also in Southern Asia. Russia too is likely to reemerge as a power centre and that would be a healthy development.

The new century has also brought far greater focus on the new and old factors that shape the security environment in this region. These no doubt, were triggered at the start of new millennium, essentially by the 11 September 2001 tragedies across the globe. This was followed by the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. Although Iraq lies outside the region, but the war and its aftermath have a profound impact on events in Southern Asia and beyond.

It needs to be recognised that stability of any region and its countries is a prerequisite for rebuilding the nation-state system that has been under tremendous pressure in parts of Southern Asia. Measures are required to be initiated by the international community to reduce and eliminate the factors that adversely impact on peace and stability.

The future conflict spectrum is likely to encompass, high technology wars (nuclear and weapons of mass destruction), space based, Revolution in Military Affairs (RMA) variety, conventional wars (all out, limited in time, space and scope) with or without high technology conditions and sub conventional conflicts (proxy war, transnational terrorism, narco-fundamentalist insurgencies, internal ethnic and sectarian conflicts, economic and technology intervention and information war). Long term causes of inter-state conflicts (20 years and beyond) could be; food, water, energy, maritime interests, demographic explosion and invasion, environmental degradation and earth's resources depletion. control of outer space, civilisation, ideological and human rights.

The world is already witnessing the fastest economic growth in Asia, and this is expected to continue for a considerably long period. The growth patterns of India and China would have major impact on not only Asia but also the world. The ongoing globalisation and information revolution could also transform Asia into a vast dynamic economic market.

Nuclear and missile proliferation is another important issue in the Asian region. Further, the threat of nuclear terrorism by state sponsored or non-state actors has also become grave. The possibility of nuclear weapons falling in the hands of fundamentalist non-state actors in Afghanistan, Pakistan or other West Asian countries cannot be ruled out. Dynamics related to proliferating of WMD need to be clearly understood and factored

into security calculus. In the above perspective, the US involvement and engagement, together with all its influences in South Asia may continue in the foreseeable future.

India, China, Japan and the US would be the largest consumers of fossil fuels by 2025. The US dominates the Gulf, which has about 65 per cent of world's oil reserves and 34 per cent of world's gas. Dependence of countries on the Middle East and Central Asia is likely to continue with important implications for security in the region, till such time indigenous or alternative sources are found.

Almost all countries of Asia require an assured environment of peace and equilibrium. The challenge is how to establish that in a durable manner so that socioeconomic and human development can take place at the desired rate. There are many areas of tension and potential conflict in Asia, including those in the seas, border and territorial disputes, cross border terrorism, ethnic violence and nuclear proliferation.

Impact of Global Terrorism

Terrorism is being increasingly used as an instrument of politics and foreign policy. This is a pernicious reversal of civilised approach to dispute settlement in general and the current trend of democratisation and cooperative security in the world in particular. Its effectiveness has been increasing because of the ever-greater vulnerabilities of modern society to acts of terrorism where democracies are especially at risk to this method of application of violent force.

Two other forms of terrorism (ethnoreligious and ideological) will rise

disproportionately, especially with the US domestic terrorism. In the post-print age. groups, even nationalities, will organise themselves without geographic constraints, bringing diaspora together and uniting issueoriented groups. Religions through the course of globalisation will paint clearer pictures of who and what has the ability to affect and influence masses of people. The terrorism and guerrilla warfare will just not attack the general legitimacy of states, but also nongovernmental organisations (NGOs), Multi-National Corporations (MNCs) and so on. Furthermore, access to weapons and methods of increasing lethality, or methods targeting digital information systems will attract wildly disproportionate effects and publicity. This could result in terrorist cells that are smaller, even familiar, and thus harder to infiltrate, track, or counter. Terrorism will be increasingly networked and will globally integrate parallel to digital global integration. It will permeate geographic boundaries and state sovereignties.

The future of terrorism appears to be marked by the survival of the fittest. And while any reduction in the numbers of terrorist groups in operation should be seen as good, the major players are still intact and we see no evidence that they will reduce their level of activity.

Russia and India support each other's stand on global and trans-border terrorism and there is convergence of interests in fighting growing terrorism.

Indo-Russia Military Cooperation

The historical background of events that led to the emergence of the India-Russia strategic cooperation is well known. India and Russia continue to have good friendly relations based on their proximity of the past. India

and Russia surely look for convergence of interests in the international field and to forge long term India-Russia strategic relationship.

Russia will remain a key country to India's security interests. Given Russia's tremendous material resources, the inherent scientific and technological infrastructure and the pride and resilience of its people, it is inevitable that the nation is on its way to emerging strong and powerful. This will provide thrust towards a polycentric world order comprising large and medium powers. While seeking a robust relationship with Moscow, greater economic cooperation particularly in the field of energy sharing from Central Asian countries has a great scope for cooperation. The ongoing crisis in Afghanistan could influence the politics, economics and the security environment of both India and Russia.

Russia and India have made enormous progress in military-technical cooperation, including joint research, professional training, and contacts between respective military branches. Such cooperation not only contributes to maintaining peace and stability both on regional and international levels, but also benefits and meets the interests of both countries.

Both the sides welcomed the opportunity to conduct joint naval exercises in 2003 and agreed that such exercises and cooperation between relevant military branches must become a regular practice. Both sides now must ensure the future development of Russian-Indian cooperation in the military-technical sphere.

The concerns that military cooperation between the two countries would destabilise the balance of forces in Asia should be dismissed. The Russian Defence Minister had

mentioned, "I do not see any danger to the balance of forces. India is the largest democracy of the world, and we have been linked by decades of close friendship. Our strategic partnership is not an empty notion." The declaration on global challenges and threats to international security and stability signed by our two country's leadership, reflects Moscow's and New Delhi's commitment to a multi-polar world order and a tolerant and pluralistic society. The document also emphasises the importance of strategic partnership and efforts against the challenges and threats to global security and stability of both countries. Russia and India are of the view that the United Nations (UN) should play an important role in international security and peace.

The UN

The global coalition to combat threats to international security of any type is already in place. There was a fresh opportunity to rededicate the terms of American engagement with the international community in protecting the world from deadly new threats, immune to conventional tools of statecraft. The notion of laws must turn its power to the task of building a world ruled by law. An order that is worth protecting and defending must rest on the principles of justice, equity and law that are embedded in universal institutions.

The evolution of institutions of international governance has perhaps lagged behind the rapid emergence of collective problems with on-border and cross-border dimensions, especially those that are global in scope or potentially so. Depending on the issue-area, geographic location, and timing, there are vast disparities in power and influence among states, international organisations, corporations, and NGOs. The

international inter-governmental institutions that collectively underpin global governance are insufficient in numbers, inadequately resourced, and sometimes incoherent in their separate policies and philosophies.

The events of 11 September 2001 should force us to rethink old and set ways of looking at the world. India has been a victim of terrorism for the past two decades. In the war against fundamentalist terrorism, past enemies can be today's allies. The concert of democracies must cooperate politically and coordinate responses with one another's law-enforcement and military forces. They must forge alliances if necessary to work around the institutionalised reluctance of global organisations to respond effectively and in time to real threats instead of posturing over imaginary grievances.

Small states put their faith in the protection of international law; some states disdainfully dismiss international law as a minor inconvenience, not a bar to any action being contemplated. Small states pin their hopes for security from predatory powers on a functioning UN system; but few of the small states declare the UN to be irrelevant unless supportive of what they desire. Small states have supported disarmament for the world, but have great apprehensions on the unilateral use of force to settle international disputes and threats of unilateral pre-emptive strikes.

The comparative advantages of the UN are its universal membership, political legitimacy, administrative impartiality, technical expertise, and convening and mobilising power. It is the world's only authenticated forum for building, consolidating and using power on behalf of the international community. Its comparative disadvantages

seem to be excessive politicisation, ponderous decision-making, a high cost structure, insufficient resources, bureaucratic rigidity and institutional timidity.

If the United States is the indispensable power, the UN is the indispensable institution. Its prestige, authority and capacity as the standing global coalition to tackle threats to international peace and security must therefore be enhanced.

In a sweeping measure last week, the UN Security Council adopted its first everformal resolution on non-proliferation. It demands that states must put in place tougher laws to prevent individuals and groups from spreading nuclear weapons and missiles across borders.

As far as Indo-Russian relations are concerned, we have had strategic relations for decades. These were based on common challenges. At the tactical level, military to military cooperation, supply of arms, spares and so on including training are very good steps and must go on.

We face common challenges, which have increased in scope. India, at the strategic level, looks forward to Russian understanding and help in accepting India as a nuclear power and our due place in the body of world governance.

REGIONAL SECURITY PERSPECTIVE

FIRST SESSION

Chairman

: Shri K Subrahmanyam, IAS (Retd)

First Paper

Lieutenant General Klimenko Anatoly Filippovich (Retd)

Second Paper

Lieutenant General VK Kapoor, PVSM (Retd)

CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS

SHRI K SUBRAHMANYAM, IAS (Retd)

I have great pleasure to preside over this session. Last I participated in an Indo-Russian seminar which was held in Moscow in 1999. My association with collaboration with the erstwhile Soviet Union goes back to the year 1962 when I participated in negotiations for purchase of equipment for the Indian Air Force. In that sense, it gives me a great pleasure to participate in this event.

FIRST SESSION: FIRST PAPER

LIEUTENANT GENERAL KLIMENKO ANATOLY FILIPPOVICH (RETD)

After the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic (USSR) disintegrated, Central Asia. including Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan, with 60 million population turned into one of the most significant regions of the world out of the quiet and stable outlying erstwhile USSR area. The deposits of oil. gas, rare non-ferrous metals and other minerals as well as convenient transit routes for global transportation attract many developed states here. It is both one of the most significant geopolitical and vulnerable regions of Eurasia, the centre of "instability arc" stretching from the Balkans through the Caucasus and India to Malaysia and the Philippines.

The countries of Central Asian region are heavily influenced by their southern neighbours. Unstable Afghanistan, where counter-terrorist operations are still underway directly borders on them. Not far away, there is Jammu and Kashmir, constantly smouldering tangle of contradictions between India and Pakistan. Both states were on the verge of war on several occasions. Further more, there exists Sinkiang-Uighur problem which concerns both Kazakhstan and China.

Almost all the countries of this region face the threat of Islamic terrorism and extremism. This threat has received "second breath" recently. The United States of America (USA) and North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) anti-terrorist operation in Afghanistan and the American hasty invasion of Iraq encourage Islamic militants all over "the Great Middle East", including Palestine, Iraq, Afghanistan and Central Asia. The proof of it is a series of terrorist acts in Uzbekistan in March-April 2004. Behind these acts are,

most obviously, representatives of the former Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan (IMU), renamed into Islamic Party of Turkmenistan (IPT) at the moment. This organisation is among the 15 commonly accepted terrorist organisations. There is information of the IMU-IPT connection with the international terrorist organisation "Al-Qaeda". The aim of the IMU-IPT is formation of the so-called Islamic Caliphate on the territory of Central Asia with the core in Fergana Valley. That is just the cause of Uzbekistan being the strategic object of international terrorists.

It should be noted that the contents of a threat for each Central Asian country has its own peculiarities. For Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan, it is extremism. which attempts to overthrow the constitutional authorities and seize the power by force. For Russia, these are attempts of Chechen separatists to reach their political aim, namely, separation from Russia by non-constitutional means. Kazakhstan shares with China the common frontier threats caused by over one million ethnic Kazakhs inhabiting the North-West of China who are striving for separation. It should be appreciated that, for the sake of stability, Kazakhstan keeps away from supporting this movement and tends to consider it a threat to its security. China is also most careful while determining approaches to this national-ethnic problem in Sinkiang. We cannot forget the possibility of new ethnic conflicts in several other countries of the region, for example, Taiikistan and Kyrgyzstan.

These threats though different in origin and essence, are similar in approach of reaching political targets by extremists and separatists, i.e. mass terror and support of international terrorist organisations.

It is well known that there are over 500 terrorist organisations in the world at the moment. Their annual budget is estimated to be over five to 20 b US Dollars that exceeds the military budget of Russia. Multi-branched network of militant training bases and centres has been formed. As a result they are capable of carrying out not only occasional acts of terrorism but full-scale terrorist operations. They are capable of posing a challenge to the world community.

International Terrorism is Accompanied by Other Threats. Drug trafficking from Afghanistan through Central Asia to Russia and Western Europe, new forms of slavery and capture of hostages have become the financial basis of terrorists.

Weapons Trafficking is Becoming Dangerous. Near impossibility of controlling trade of production technologies of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), especially chemical and biological weapons has increased the danger of their use of terrorist groups. The first signals of Al-Qaeda obtaining some WMD have already been received from Bin Laden. This will encourage some states to attack the sources of terrorist threat in order to neutralise them as a preventive measure. Thus, element of unpredictability in respect of regional and global stability is increasing. It would be difficult to prevent spread of missile technology being rendered as foreign military assistance.

As political and religious extremism, terrorism and organised crimes are becoming more and more united, their actions are acquiring international scope and pose direct threat to people's security and governments

of different countries are forced to deploy or earmark more military troops for their neutralisation.

The Confederation of Independent (CIS) Central Asian states have been trying to regain regional stability within the framework of the Collective Security Treaty (CST) since the beginning of the 1990s. But their actions were passive and defensive. Uzbekistan stood apart blocking initiatives to strengthen the CST. The situation in the region stabilised to some extent after the start of anti-terrorist operations in Afghanistan. As a result of this operation the military bases of the USA and the NATO were established in this region. One more security unit - Anti-terrorist coalition force was formed in addition to the CST. However, if we analyse the process of the US struggle against terrorism we comprehend that the US military presence in Central Asia is not only for the struggle against terrorism but on the plea of anti-terrorist struggle. Washington has promoted its concept of unipolar world.

To reinforce the leading role of the US in the world it is necessary, according to Z Bzhezinsky's famous work *Great Chessboard*, "to advance global democratic order and cooperation to Eurasia". In order to achieve this the following is likely to be attempted:-

- (a) Eurasian regional centre within the CIS headed by Russia should not be permitted to rise.
- (b) Energy resources in the Caucasian-Caspian and Central Asian regions should be controlled and the USA and geopolitical domination provided on the Southern Russian frontier.

(c) Strategic presence deep inside the People's Republic of China (PRC) should be arranged, taking into consideration the further possibility of China turning into a powerful centre and the main rival.

Thus, Europe is gradually likely to move into the "rear" of the USA policy, with its "front" moving deep into the Central Asia.

In our opinion, the geopolitical centre of the world is also moving this way. To the east of this centre there is the strengthened China, to the west there are oil giants of the Middle East, to the south there are new nuclear states India and Pakistan. We can assume that the US interests in consolidation in the region are significant. This is bound to promote economic globalisation and unipolar world. Consequently, partnership relations with Russia and the other Central Asian states are of secondary importance to the US. At the same time the US is pursuing its interests by:-

- (a) Guaranteed access to the regional resources.
- (b) Development of communication networks which are certain to make profit for the US corporations.
- (c) Political influence.
- (d) Promotion of geo-economical, geopolitical and geo-strategic interests which are essential for the US and require its military presence in the region.

What can be the consequences of this presence for the main states in the region? On the one hand, it has played a positive role. After destruction of the international ferrorist training bases the serious source of

threats to the CIS states and Russia have been neutralised. The process of peace, stability and reconstruction is continuing in Afghanistan. The threat of Islamisation in the Central Asian countries is decreasing. Military operation against extremists was advantageous for India and China as it prevented the possibility of spread of Islamic fundamentalism and terrorism to their territories.

On the other hand, the military presence of the US creates huge strategic problems for the local countries. The US has obtained access to the military infrastructure of the CAR. They have gained access to update airfield network according to the US standards, to investigate the regional peculiarities and to develop them. Negative factors of this sort adversely affect the states of the region. Industrial and military complexes deep inside Russia, China and part of India are surveyed from the military base in the vicinity of Bishkek.

Being supplementary to the US military bases and groups in Japan, South Korea and some other countries of the Asia-Pacific Region, the newly established military bases in Central Asia provide the US with complete surveillance over the Asian continent mainland as well as the Pacific and Indian Oceans. We would say nothing of Iran's negative reaction to the US military bases established in Central Asia. It is quite evident after the US President included Iran into the "axis of evil".

The long-term presence of "unauthorised military force" will adversely affect the region and will compromise security interests of many states. For instance, it worries China a lot. This is the reason for China strengthening her relations of strategic partnership with

Russia, Central Asian states and India. It is well known that Beijing, on the one hand, considers the USA to be its economic partner, but on the other hand, treats it very watchfully as a political rival.

The emerging political situation in Central Asia has encouraged China to become more active. Moreover successful experience of the Chinese reforms is of interest to the Central Asian states. In most of them, China is the third foreign country in the number of joint ventures set up lately. Turkmenistan is rapidly developing its cooperation with China. Kazakhstan is promoting bilateral relations. In 1997, they signed the agreement "On cooperation in the field of oil and gas". The project of pipeline layout from Central Asia to Western China and further to Eastern Asia is being considered.

Beijing competes with Washington not only in geopolitics but in geoeconomics too. China is actively getting involved into the global struggle for Central Asian resources. China tends to increase its economic, trade, financial and, partly, strategic influence on Central Asia concentrating its attention on Kazakhstan. Kazakhstan and China have not only common economic interests but also common threats to security.

As far as the political interests are concerned, Beijing will most probably lay stress on the following priorities:-

- (a) Acknowledgement of Chinese interests in the region.
- (b) Elimination of separatism and Islamic threats.
- (c) Countering increasing American expansion.

It is clear that development of rivalry in the region can have negative consequences, ie creation of barriers between states and restoration of "the cold war" with new foundations and new "characters".

In this situation Russia is trying not to lose the initiative of reinforcing stability in the region. It continues its cooperation with the USA within the framework of established anti-terrorist coalition. The cooperation in Afghanistan region is exclusively for humanitarian assistance.

Undoubtedly, the countries of the region should continuously and effectively work for perfection of their security system. Development of the Common Security Treaty Organisation (CSTO) into a military union can provide a good foundation for defence of member-states by their own forces. With more time it will, be able to solve this problem. But even effective cooperation within the framework of the CSTO, may not be sufficient to counter all threats especially terrorism, drug trafficking and, nuclear weapons control. The member-states of the CSTO should develop parallel strategic partnership with China, India, Mongolia and other interested states. The aim is to achieve extended security system which could effectively hold out against wide range of threats. We believe that strengthening of strategic partnership would be most efficient within the framework of the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO). For this purpose, we should speed up its formation and development.

We will need to perfect the legal basis of the SCO, work out procedures for multilateral cooperation including the security aspects, and expand its field of activity. The SCO should be able to execute both preventive non-military actions to eliminate threats of extremism, terrorism, and

counter-terrorist and peacemaking operations to keep peace and enforce it.

Self-confident SCO with membership of the main states of the region will be able to cooperate efficiently with other international organisations and states. The SCO is certain to turn into a real factor of stability and peace. In the long-term the SCO may form the foundation for collective security outside the Central Asian region. Interacting with other regional organisations and collaborating closely with the UN it is likely to become a link in the future Eurasian "arc of stability", stretching from Western Europe to the Asian Pacific region.

FIRST SESSION: SECOND PAPER

LIEUTENANT GENERAL VK KAPOOR, PVSM (RETD)

Introduction

The term "South Asia" evokes the context of the erstwhile Indian sub continent. a reversion to the region during the British rule. It also reminds us of the association of South Asian Association of Regional Cooperation (SAARC) and the ever present hostility of a prominent neighbour. Hence, to differentiate, we have adopted the term "Southern Asia" whose strategic construct is more relevant to the regional security than mere "South Asia". In this context it would be pertinent to note that when we use the term "Southern Asia", interpretation is that it encompasses the arc around the Indian Ocean from east coast of Africa, through the Persian Gulf, through the Arab and Islamic world, through Central Asia and China to the Malacca Strait and then to the Bay of Bengal. This is inclusive and representative of the overlapping security concerns of our immediate periphery. However, even this wider region cannot claim exclusivity security concerns because these concerns are always overlapping and tend to widen their geographical spheres of influence around a troubled spot or a source. For example the consequences of the growth of terrorism in Pakistan-Afghanistan territory were so horrendously played out in the USA on 11 September 2001.

For the sake of focus and clarity many analysts tend to analyse the geo-strategy of a region by dividing it into pathways or clusters through which movement in terms of ideas, economic exchange and military power occurs. Such analysis also throws up the security perspectives of that cluster and how

it affects the security of the region as a whole. Four pathways which are relevant for discussion are as follows:-

- (a) China-Tibet-India and the Himalayan Kingdoms.
- (b) China-Pakistan-India and the USA.
- (c) Central Asia and Greater Central Asia with the USA, Russia, India and China being the interested parties.
- (d) China-Myanmar-Bay of Bengal.

CHINA-TIBET-INDIA AND THE HIMALAYAN KINGDOMS

The actual issue in this area is the limits of Chinese and Indian influence in the Himalayan region. The requirement is to establish a stable balance of power and an acceptable pattern of relationships which preclude wars or any kind of confrontation which could lead to a war or even a border skirmish. Here we should aim to extend Sino-Indian truce and rapprochement pending a political settlement. The two sides have already begun to strengthen their cooperation in various areas including Tibet related issues. In fact during the Indian Prime Minister's (PM's) visit to China in 2003, there was a clamour on India having compromised on its Tibet policy. Especially the decision by both India and Pakistan to weaponise their nuclear arsenals has clearly changed the conventional wisdom about building security through buffers and Tibet is no longer referred to in those terms in contemporary literature on security issues. The Dalai Lama's proposal for declaring Tibet as a zone of peace should best suit the interests of the three surrounding nuclear weapon states and the larger region. But despite these changing connotations on the surface level, Tibet continues to generate mutual suspicions rather than mutual confidence in China-South Asian strategic equations.

China has maintained a posture of seeking protection of Nepal's independence and identity as a sovereign nation state in its own right and has encouraged Nepal to maintain equidistance between China and India. Nepal in turn has also ostensibly maintained a principle of balance between its two great neighbours even though its historical, geographical, cultural, and civilisational roots lie with India. As far as trade and commerce is concerned its interdependence with India goes back to ancient times. Hence not withstanding its formal policy of an equidistant relationship. of necessity, Nepal maintains a "special relationship" with India. Beijing has repeatedly tried to strengthen China-Nepal ties in the name of ensuring Nepals independence. However lately China has displayed greater understanding of its limitations and has followed a more balanced Nepal policy. This also reflects China's greater self confidence in ensuring the integration of Tibet.

Bhutan is known as "Drukyul" (land of thunder dragon) and traces its history to 500 BC. It is located in the Eastern Himalayas and stretches 170 kilometres (km) North to South and 300 km East to West. It shares a 470 km long border with China's Tibet Autonomous Region (TAR) and 605 km long border with India. Bhutan enjoys a special relationship with India by virtue of Indo-Bhutan Treaty of Friendship of 1949 by stipulating that Bhutan would be guided by India's advice in the conduct of its external affairs which implies its foreign and defence affairs. China,

however, has never accepted this special relationship and continues to woo Bhutan to wean it away from India's influence. The success of this policy of China can be seen by the fact that Bhutan has since asserted its independence and developed formal ties with 18 countries, setting up five residential missions abroad and opening border negotiations with Beijing since early 1980s. Like most South Asian countries. China's borders with Bhutan have remained historically undefined as neither Tibet nor Bhutan has followed the Westphalian model of territorial nation state. So far 16 rounds of talks (1984 to 2002) have taken place between China and Bhutan. Bhutan's strategic location with regard to the Chumbi Valley is fully appreciated by China and India alike hence the border negotiations have been progressing slowly. The greatest achievement of the border talks has been the 1998 Agreement on the Maintenance of Peace and Tranquility in the Border Areas. This Agreement provides for mutual respect for" independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Bhutan" (Article 1) and to maintain status quo on the boundary as before March 1959 (Article 3) and maintain peace and tranquility in border areas pending final settlement of dispute.

China has finally come to accept the fact that despite Bhutan's posture of moving away from its ostensible dependence on India, the latter has too many levers for Bhutan to breakaway from India's influence. Moreover, both China and Bhutan have more serious problems facing them in other areas of nation building than the paranoia of their bilateral ties.

INDIA-PAKISTAN-CHINA AND THE USA

The major characteristics of this cluster are peculiar and rather exclusive. It

constitutes more than 40 per cent of the world's population and boasts of the two oldest living civilisations of the world i.e. Hinduism, Confucian and Shinto. China and India are also two of the fastest growing economies of the world while Pakistan is on the fringes of being a failed economy and at the current rate of growth two of them are likely to find a place among the top three or four economies by the year 2020. It is the only region where all three prominent nations have long standing territorial disputes which have defied political solutions so far and this makes their nuclear status fearsome for the whole world because Western analysts believe that limited arsenals are more likely to generate risks than to guarantee risk reduction because the geometry of strategic competition in South Asia makes triangular or bilateral treaty arrangements unlikely since none of the three parties will accept formalised equality or inequality with one another. This is the only region, and I refer to the line of control in Jammu and Kashmir (J and K), where firing of small arms, mortars and artillery across undemarcated borders can occur at any moment notwithstanding the current ceasefire arrangements between India and Pakistan. The Line of Actual Control (LAC) with China is more stable. The Western flank of this region has given birth and sustenance to international terrorism by using it as an instrument of politics and foreign policy. The terrorism fostered and nurtured in the western flank of the subcontinent by Pakistan is oriented to religious, ideology driven, violence and slowly they have entered the mainstream of political life in Pakistan. What is most alarming is the likelihood of nuclear weapons falling in the hands of terrorist groups who due to their political legitimacy may control the levers of political power in Pakistan, in the future. Such apocalyptic settings are a danger to regional peace and stability.

The recent breakthrough in India-China relations are a result of a fundamental reappraisal of India by China which is evident from a report of *People's Daily* of 21 May 2001 - "Steadily warming India-US relations have resulted in widespread attention to the geo-politics of Asia. It is difficult to predict whether or not India will become a strategic ally of China or of the United States, but the sudden attractiveness of India will sooner or later alter the regional balance of power between the three countries".

In a paper presented at the Washington based Centre for Strategic and International Studies, visiting scholar Venu Rajamony says, "China's fear is that India might do a China on China — that is to say that just as China and United States put aside a history of hostility and ideological differences in the 1970s to forge a tacit alliance against the Soviet Union, will India and the US who have had a prickly relationship, find common ground by uniting against China". Rajamony calls "India-China-US Triangle" a soft balance of power system" in the making.

As far as India-Pakistan relationship is concerned, strategically the balance is tilting against Pakistan steadily and inexorably. As the Indian economy grows, as India strengthens her relationship with the West and Central Asian countries, as the longerterm interest of India and the US converge, and as India's engagement with China gathers substance, Pakistan could find it tough to maintain its traditional position of hostility and there is reason to believe that China will now be more cautious about anything that impinges on Indian interests. But this is no reason to celebrate because an unstable nuclear armed society that cannot come to terms with geo-political realities can be a danger to the entire region. India has a stake in a stable neighbour who is content with itself and hence India along with the US should do all it can to achieve this.

CENTRAL ASIA AND GREATER CENTRAL ASIA WITH THE USA, RUSSIA, INDIA AND CHINA BEING THE INTERESTED PARTIES

The term Central Asia encompasses the five states of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan. Greater Central Asia, due to geographical contiguity, Islamic identity and ethnic affinity, includes South Caucasus, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iran, Turkey and Xingjian province of China. The following issues in this cluster which have a bearing on the security perspectives in the region will be covered:

- (a) Resource potential.
- (b) Key players.
- (c) Security concerns and reasons for the US involvement.
- (d) The future.

Resource Potential

The oil resources of the Caspian Region (Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Azerbaijan and Uzbekistan) were initially estimated to be around 163 billion barrels (bb). The region's proven oil resources are between 16 and 32 bb which compare well to 22 bb for the USA and 17 bb for North Sea. The region has substantially fewer reserves as compared to the Middle East and represents possibly the last unexplored oil bearing region in the world. Kazakhstan has the largest oil reserves in the area (85 bb estimated) followed by Turkmenistan (32 bb), Azerbaijan (27bb) and Uzbekistan (1 bb).

Gas reserves in the Caspian Region are estimated at 263 to 337 trillion cubic feet

(tcf). Turkmenistan has the largest gas reserves (159 tcf), Kazakhstan has 88 tcf while Azerbaijan and Uzbekistan have 35 tcf each.

Recent oil deposits in very large quantity (8 to 50bb) have been found in Kashgan off shore in Kazakhstan. These reserves discovered by a consortium of Western Oil Companies in the northern Caspian Sea may well be the largest oil discovery in 20 years and could surpass the size of North Sea oil fields.

Landlocked Central Asia and the Caspian region need outlets to deliver resources to the outside world. Previously the oil and gas were pumped through a vast Soviet network which is now owned by Russia. Pipelines and their routes have become significant in the new great game in Central Asia.

Key Players

In the post Soviet era, the key players in the geopolitical space around Central Asia were Russia. China and the United States. Russia maintained its traditional dominance in its former southern provinces. China, as it developed its economic relations, with Central Asian countries, gradually increased its own political influence, while seeking to avoid confrontation with Moscow. Despite its interest in the Caspian, the US relegated the region to the periphery of its foreign policy activities. Post-Soviet Central Asia remained under the domination of Russia although the US had come to exercise some influence. Post 11 September 2001 altered the previous equations and Central Asia became the epicentre of geo-political changes on a global scale which redefined the situation around Central Asia. The United States became the region's main economic donor and security manager.

The US Secretary of State Colin Powell stated, during his visit to Tashkent in December 2001, that the US interests in Central Asia far exceed the conflict in Afghanistan. This statement was interpreted as proof of the US long term interests and strategic designs in Eurasia, including the control of substantial energy resources. This poses a challenge to Russia and China. For the present, the US success at stamping out Islamic militants in the region serves everyone's interests. But will Russia yield to Washington control over its former southern provinces? What will be China's relation to the US military bases on its western borders? We will have to wait and watch.

The Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO) was established in 1996 primarily to resolve border disputed among the signatories and to reduce armed forces along their borders. Over the years the group's objective evolved into combating Islamic extremism and narcotics. On 15 June 2001, the Presidents of China, Russia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgistan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan signed a declaration establishing the SCO and the Shangai Convention for struggle against terrorism, separatism and extremism. All the participants have their own interests at stake? For Russia, it formalises its influence and speaks of its principal concern - the menace of Islamic radicalism. For the Central Asian members it is advantageous to have an alliance with two permanent members of the United Nations Security Council. China's interest is in maintaining stability in its Xinjian region which is affected by the Muslim Turkicspeaking Uighur separatist movement that has gained new momentum amid the new Muslim renaissance. Beijing desires cooperation from Central Asian states in suppressing Uighur separatism. China also has an ambitious 10 year economic development plan for its North Western region to tap energy and other resources from Central Asia, especially Kazakhstan. China fears a "Chechnya" in the western part of the country bordering a vast Muslim world that can provide moral and material support to separatist ambitions.

Security Concerns and Reasons for the US Involvement

Most of the reasons that led to the involvement of the US in "Greater Central Asia" were obvious even before the 11 September 2001 attacks. Listing these reasons will enable a better understanding of the security concerns in the region and the motivation for the US involvement. The reasons are:-

- (a) Taliban ruled Afghanistan was known to be the breeding ground for terrorism with the presence of Al Qaeda.
- (b) War on terrorism would require bases in the areas, North and South of Afghanistan and hence the interest in Central Asia and Pakistan.
- (c) Tracking down fugitives and conducting mop-up operations would require a well developed, well protected infrastructure.
- (d) Taliban with support from Pakistan and Saudi Arabia had been brutalising Afghans and spreading disorder in surrounding states particularly the nascent and generally unstable countries of Central Asia.
- (e) Pakistan, the arch patron of Taliban along with Al Qaeda was sponsoring infiltration of insurgents into the state of Jammu and Kashmir which was

responsible for tensions between the two nations.

- (f) Pakistan was mired in economic problems and instability and hosted an array of militant Islamist groups. Americans were apprehensive of the danger of a nuclear war between India and Pakistan, or the implosion of a nuclear armed Pakistan.
- (g) Heroin, using the Central Asian states and Iran as conduits, was moving out of Afghanistan and Pakistan and reaching the West.
- (h) The great rush for Caspian energy threatened to unleash destabilising rivalries among the states in the outer periphery including Iran, Turkey, Pakistan, India and China, in a region that had been cordoned by the Soviet Empire for nearly 150 years.
- (j) There was a hope that energy revenues would boost economic development of Caspian-Sea zone and Central Asia.
- (k) 11 September 2001 attacks revealed vital US national interests in the region and focused the US Government to the deeper issues gripping Central Asia.
- (I) After the war against Afghanistan, the remnants of Taliban and Al Qaeda dispersed into adjoining areas of Pakistan and Central Asia. Hence a long term role of the US military in the region is seen as indispensable for the stability of Afghanistan, Central Asia and Pakistan.
- (m) The region provides fertile ground for radical variants of Islam whose

- political role was limited during the Soviet rule but is now apparent on civic life and politics.
- (n) The people of this post colonial setting are looking for a new role and identity and Central Asia's culture and religious make up, guarantees greater contact southwards with the Islamic World and the danger of radical variants of Islam creeping into this area through mosques and madrassas (religious schools) is worrisome.
- (o) Being autocrats, all Central Asian leaders are eager to harness America's might and its single minded focus on terrorism to strengthen their grip on power. 11 September 2001 helped them gain the American support. Now they are trying to anchor that support by offering themselves as partners in the campaign again Islamist terrorism to ensure the security of their regimes and for regional geo-political gains.
- (p) The US itself may resist withdrawal from Central Asia for fear of communicating weakness to adversaries. Moreover 'Resolve' and 'Staying Power' have become very important ingredients of war against terrorism and a hasty departure may send wrong signals to allies and opponents and may invite more terrorist attacks.
- (q) Strategic US emplacement in Greater Central Asia will remain important to the war on terrorism and other strategic interests in the region.

The Muslim States Around Central Asia

Essential geo-political realities in the

Muslim states located in the West, South and East of Central Asia are a pointer to the developing security situations in this region. Let us examine the emerging situation in some of the key areas:-

- (a) In Iran, Ayatollah Khomeini's revolution of 1979 has lost support on account of its many failures, its draconian moral codes and its deafness to the yearnings of Iran's young restless population. Rarely has the US popularity been higher among young Iranians.
- In contrast to the above, in Persian (b) Gulf the US arouses anger and hate among the people who blame the US for supporting Israel's repression of the Palestinians and for waging what appears to them, a war against Islam. The American decision to wage war on Iraq on the grounds that Saddam Hussein was developing weapons of mass destruction (WMD) is seen as hypocritical in view of Israel's nuclear weapons. The hardships imposed on the ordinary Iragis are seen as oppression orchestrated by the US. A steady radicalisation of young Arabs bodes ill for greater Central Asia, which will be increasingly exposed to the political currents of the Middle East. This could also destabilise Pakistan and Afghanistan. This is all the more likely if the 'regime change' in Irag results in anarchy and fragmentation which destabilises the surrounding countries and the Arab World.
- (c) Projection of the American power in Central Asia has led to a strategic reassessment in Turkey. If Turkey plays an important role in Central Asia and Afghanistan in the post-Taliban period

the balance between its European and Asian orientation could shift to the latter, adversely affecting its relationship with the European Union (EU) and its membership which Turkey desires. Should Turkey decide that membership of EU is unlikely, it could choose to align itself with the US and Israel.

(d) A more general consequence of the American war on terrorism is that the number of states with nuclear weapons may increase. Advances in high precision weaponry and availability of off the shelf (COTS) enabling technologies – for example global position system – could empower them to deliver nuclear weapons on target. Pakistan's fragility, Russia's ill-secured military installations and North Korea's nuclear weapons could ease access to fissile materials. The security risks would then be substantially increased.

India's Interest

India has vital interest in Central and Greater Central Asia. Over 70 per cent of India's oil consumption is currently imported amounting to approximately 80 million tons per year. This is likely to go upto 150 million tons per year by 2020. Disruption of supplies will severely impact economic growth. India would want to have alternative and not be dependent on the Gulf oil alone.

Central Asia with a population of 55 million is a huge consumer market hungry for a range of goods and services which Indian industry and financial institutions can satisfy. While three of the five Central Asian States are well connected by air, there is still a lack of satisfactory surface routes, banking channels and so on which hamper expansion

of trade. Economic cooperation with India is possible through joint ventures in banking, insurance, agriculture, construction, automobile components, leather goods, dairy based industry, steel, science and technology, defence, information technology (IT) and pharmaceutical industry. Certain Indian commodities for example, tea, drugs, pharmaceuticals and fine chemicals are already available in the Central Asian markets.

If the relations with Pakistan improve, direct land routes between India and Central Asian States can be developed via Pakistan and Afghanistan in which case the earlier plans by an US Company UNOCOL with support from Washington can be revived for construction of a 790-mile gas pipeline connecting Turkmenistan to Pakistan with an extension to India.

The Future

Central Asia proper is connected, like a seamless web with South Caucasus, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iran, Turkey and China's Xingjian province. While reflecting on the bigger picture it becomes adequately clear how forces from one part of this region radiate to other parts and happenings in one part have repercussions in other parts. Therefore, any major change in one part will affect other parts often quickly and dramatically.

Post 11 September 2001, the US counter-terrorism activity is likely to engage the US in dealing with fragile Governments with autocratic leaders. Military operations against small, clandestine and mobile groups such as Al Qaeda will involve intrusions into areas with unfamiliar societies. These operations will require a protracted and proactive post conflict US presence which will

invariably be resented by parts or whole of the region.

Central Asia, post-Saddam Iraq and Pakistan will pose challenges which the US, unilaterally will not be able to handle. Given the multi-facetted nature of the problem, a multi-lateral strategy involving the affected and the interested parties will have to be evolved. A regional summit to promote peace. stability and mutually beneficial cooperation in the Caspian and Greater Central Asian regions could be convened. This summit could launch a comprehensive and multifaceted process for promoting stability and peaceful cooperation in the regions. The process should be sponsored by the four key players namely Russia, China, India and the US. The process should address all concerns through institutionalised mechanisms and on a sustained basis, including questions relating to extremism, terrorism and drug trafficking. The process should also promote a 'framework' of international cooperation in building infrastructure for efficient and cost effective utilisation of the hydrocarbon resources of the region. The same process could facilitate the rebuilding of Afghanistan and addressing the socio-economic needs of Afghan people.

CHINA, MYANMAR, AND THE BAY OF BENGAL

The final channel or movement which could be significant in the future, concerns the relationship between China-Myanmar and the activity in the Bay of Bengal. China has two interests. One is the economic development of Yunnan which has been one of the underdeveloped regions of China and the second strategic interest is that China believes that it is an Indian Ocean power and hence India alone should not dominate the Indian Ocean.

To develop Yunnan, China has been trying to access the waters of the Bay of Bengal and hence the significance of the road building activity through Myanmar. China-Myanmar trade has been going on since the 1980s and has developed significantly to more than a billion dollars per year. Thus it could be argued that China's activity in the Bay of Bengal is purely economical. However, bearing in mind that China is a great power and has major strategic interests in the region including presence in the Indian Ocean; China's presence in Coco Island and in the Bay of Bengal has been explained as an expression of their great power status.

One recollects that People's Liberation Army Navy (PLAN) sent a small flotilla in 1986 led by Commander of the South China Sea Fleet to make port calls at Bangladesh, Pakistan and Sri Lanka, clearly omitting the most important South Asian nation iè, India. At Chittagong, the Commander of PLAN's guided missile destroyer No 132 made a critical comment to the press saying that China did not recognise that Indian Ocean belongs to India alone and this has been repeatedly used in South Asia's strategic

debates. China's literature on strategic affairs continues to project India as China's most likely opponent in Southern Asia. General Zhao Zangi, then Commandant of China's Academy of Military Sciences, is on record having said that China would extend its naval operations further than the South and East China Seas to check attempts by India to dominate the Indian Ocean. China's routes to Indian Ocean are basically three ie through Myanmar, Malacca Strait and via Karakoram highway through Tibet and Pakistan. The driving force for China's sea-faring remains economic, though its prowess and strategic vision do also contribute in its sea-based approach to its ties with South Asian countries.

In the end I would like to recall what Nicholas Roerich who was given the name as "The Maharishi" by our former Prime Minister Mr Atal Bihari Vajpayee said about the India-Russia magnet, "What attract both countries is best summed up: India's heart is reaching out for the infinite Russia. The great Indian magnet is attracting Russian hearts. How joyful it is to see the vitality in India-Russia ties. There exists beauty in the Indian-Russian magnet".

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Lieutenant General YM Bammi (Retd)

My question is for Lieutenant General Klimenko Anatoly Flippovich. He emphasised the role of the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO) to solve problem of insurgency and other security issues in Central Asian region. The Americans have already established bases in two member countries of the SCO. Do you think that there is enough strength in the SCO to withstand expansion of the NATO and the American influence in the region?

Lieutenant General Klimenko Anatoly Flippovich (Retd)

The question is justified and I will frankly tell you that the answer is "no". The SCO is not a military organisation. This organisation is to provide an opportunity for the countries which not only have common interests and problems but may also have disputes between themselves. It aims to provide an opportunity to come to an agreement through discussions. Joint fight against a common threat is only based on mutual agreement. These are the principles of this organisation and are expressed in its Charter.

The SCO is in its formative stage. At this stage we are only discussing on what kind of structure should be there. It remains to be seen whether the members of the organisation will establish these structures. It is visualised that the capabilities of this organisation will allow it to overcome regional and trans-regional threats.

As regards the US military bases, these have been established based on bilateral agreements between the US, Kyrghistan, Kazakhastan and Uzbekistan. These are on

a temporary basis only for counter-terrorism in Afghanistan. This presence may go on for a very long time. We need to create capabilities, forces and conditions so that presence of extra regional powers in this region become inappropriate.

Major General Ashok Joshi, VSM (Retd)

My question is for Lieutenant General Klimenko Anatoly Flippovich. Your proposal for widening the scope of the SCO is excellent. But it would take time. In the interim, is it possible for Russia to establish one to one joint working groups with the nations involved?

Lieutenant General Klimenko Anatoly Flippovich (Retd)

The fact is that one to one relations with these countries are stronger than multilateral relations. It is likely to lead to strengthening of multilateral relations within this organisation. Each state of the region recognises the threats which it is facing. The best example in this regard is the case of Uzbekistan. The states have started to understand the necessity of strengthening the SCO.

I would like to add one more point. We are talking about participation by India in the SCO. The growing potential and influence of India and China will enhance the potential of the SCO.

Major General Victor N Chernov

The question is for Lieutenant General VK Kapoor.

(a) In your presentation you have mentioned regarding the traingular

relationship of India, China and the USA. I would like to know about the possibility of a triangular relationship of India, China and Russia. The leaders of these countries have some sort of an ongoing political process and regularly meet at the General Assembly of the United Nations Organisation. How do you assess these possibilities?

(b) If Pakistan expresses its willingness to join this organisation as well, will it pose any problems?

Lieutenant General VK Kapoor, PVSM (Retd)

What I presented was a view of the China's *People's Daily*. That was one view in a Chinese newspaper. China has changed their stance towards India. Since the 1980s there has been a rapprochement between India and China. That view is not necessarily the official view. But the view is that because India is becoming economically important, the United States is trying to weigh whether India would lean towards the United States or will it ally with China. It has an important message.

As far as India-China-Russia triangle is concerned, we are aware that talks are going on. If this triangular power balance occurs, it would be in the interest of all the three nations in the long run. At present, nobody wants to confront the United States because it is a unipolar world. It is all happening behind the scenes so far.

Air Marshal Vinod Patney, SYSM, PVSM, AVSM, VrC (Retd)

Bonhomie and friendship between India and Russia extends over many decades and it is obvious even in this hall today. My questions are:-

- (a) Is it possible for Russia to intercede on behalf of India to get international recognition as a nuclear weapon state? To what extent are you in a position to do so without undermining your own position?
- (b) What is taking place in Georgia today? Whether there is any linkage or parallel between what is happening in Georgia and what is taking place in the Central Asian Republics?

Lieutenant General Klimenko Anatoly Flippovich (Retd)

The first part of the question is a difficult one which is going beyond my competence. It has a military aspect and a political aspect. I can only state my own opinion. Proliferation of nuclear weapons does not contribute to stability in the world. On the other hand, each sovereign state has a right to ensure its security with such means and ways as it deems fit and which it can create. I would like to say that possession of nuclear weapons and recognition as a nuclear power state not only enhances defence capability of a country but also carries additional responsibility towards other members of the international community and has implications regarding use of nuclear weapons. If India considers its nuclear weapons as part of political means, it is one thing, but if India considers them as weapon to be used during combat it has a different connotation.

As regards the second part of the question, the US influence in Georgia and Armenia is inimical to our interests.

Major General YK Gera (Retd)

My question is for General Klimenko. The CAR have been part of the erstwhile Soviet Union and are in the Russian area of influence. The US and the NATO military bases have already been established in Kyrghistan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan. Although in answer to another question you have mentioned that these are temporary and based on mutual understanding of the concerned governments but are not time bound and can become near permanent. What is the limit of tolerance as far as the march of NATO eastward is concerned before Russia concludes that their vital national interests are threatened? And hence they feel that there is a need to take some proactive measures.

Lieutenant General Klimenko Anatoly Flippovich (Retd)

The discussion is very interesting. Of course, these factors play a vital role. The question is when would the limit of tolerance towards eastward expansion of NATO be reached and when would Russia take active measures against such expansion? President of Russia has declared many times that the attitude of Russia towards eastward expansion of NATO is not positive. We have had numerous discussions with the NATO members. The NATO says that the expansion of the alliance is the expansion of the democratic territory. They say, "express train of democracy is moving towards the East". From our experience, we consider this fast express democracy train, as a military armoured train. We say, that NATO is a political and military alliance, and not a democratic alliance. Besides, the policy can change tomorrow.

But as the NATO bases comprising airfields, intelligence gathering apparatus, air defence facilities and so on get closer to the Russian borders, Russia may perceive these as a threat. There is no guarantee that they will not be used against Russia if the policy changes. On the other hand, there are relations of strategic partnership between Russia and NATO. Even though Russia does not completely agree with the NATO policy, still Russia endorses NATO operations which are in line with the Russian interests.

The essence of Russian policy is that if we strengthen links by which we have maintained security scenario, this would contribute to the future stability. We should not forget that Russia still owns a great nuclear potential. The economy of Russia is developing fast and military power of Russia would also follow this trend. In a situation of emergency, Russia would be able to ensure its security.

Major General Ostankov Vladimir Ivanovich

There is an impression that there is a negative attitude towards Russia's stance in relation to the eastward expansion of NATO. There is an interesting expression quoted by one of the Indian speakers, "under condition of unipolar world no one wants to confront the USA". Russia is also in a similar position. As you know Russia is in a very difficult economic state.

When there was the Soviet Union, the USA paid attention to the Soviet Union and very deliberate and justified decisions were taken by both sides. Today the USA looks down upon Russia. The USA also looks down on other countries in the world. The best example here is of Germany and France. Even though they are NATO members, they opposed the war in Iraq which was started by the USA. With these attitudes it was a very easy step for the USA to take a decision for eastward expansion of NATO despite the protests from the Russian side.

This is a very negative development and the geo-strategic aspects of the expansion of the NATO are clear to all. NATO has new and old members. We perceive the NATO expansion not as strengthening the organisation but weakening it.

The war against Iraq in 2003 has divided NATO into new and old members. Although NATO says that all decisions are by consensus, this is not a fact. And the second aspect of this question which leads to the collapse of NATO, is the attitude of the European members of the NATO towards the presence of the USA in this alliance. The Europeans are increasingly recognising that they have to take their destiny in their own hands and not be guided by the USA.

As a "counter force" and I would not be afraid to use the term "counter force", the European Union is creating its own Armed Forces. These will defend their interests in Europe. These aspects which I have mentioned in the context of the eastward expansion of the NATO are not as dangerous as these may seem to you. In the immediate or in the long term, it may lead to the collapse of the NATO.

Lieutenant General Klimenko Anatoly Flippovich (Retd)

The aspect which General Ostankov has just mentioned is valid. In addition we very well understand that the expansion of NATO is not the initiative of Europeans but the initiative of the USA. This factor will become the basis for future disputes between the Europeans and the USA in the context of the war in Iraq. Therefore, we can question their idea of a unipolar world. This is not the ultimate truth. As Mr Gorbachev, a former

President of the erstwhile Soviet Union had mentioned, "process is going on".

I would like to come back to the necessity of strengthening our interaction between Russia and India. These interactions would be of help in creating a multipolar world and we have to take concrete and specific measures and not just talk about it.

Vice Admiral Inderjit Bedi,PVSM,AVSM (Retd)

My questions are for Lieutenant General Klimenko and Lieutenant General VK Kapoor.

- (a) General Klimenko mentioned that there had been discussions between the Russia and the USA on cooperation for anti-terrorism. What has been Russia's experience in this discussion on cooperation?
- (b) General VK Kapoor, you showed the Sea element clusters of the Bay of Bengal, which appears rather overdone, particularly when you have not talked about the Arabian Sea or the Indian Ocean. The US 5th Fleet has been building up in the area right from the time of the British withdrawal during the mid 1960s. Should that not be emphasised rather than emphasising on the Bay of Bengal cluster only?

Dr Ramakant Dwivedi, IDSA

My question is for General Klimenko. I fully subscribe to the view on religious extremism which is one of the most serious threats to the Central Asian security. Bomb blasts in Tashkent in March and April 2004 are perhaps the work of splinter group Hizbul Tehrif called Jamat. What is your perception?

The second question pertains to deployment of troops. Is there a move to turn the Russian Army's 201 Division's deployment on Tajik-Afghan border to a permanent one. And if so, what are the hurdles?

Lieutenant General Klimenko Anatoly Filippovich (Retd)

The question about cooperation between Russia and the US, would get covered during presentations on peacekeeping operations in a subsequent session.

The second question relates to politics and we will only state our personal opinion.

The perception pertaining to Taskent terrorist explosions is negative not only as perceived by the Russian government or Russian leadership but also as per the perception of the common people because they have had experience of such terrorist explosions. Therefore, Karimov's visit to Moscow and meeting with Russian President, Vladimir Putin, indicate mutual understanding between our countries. Russia fully supports joint efforts to counter the terrorists in the region.

As regards the Russian bases in Tajikistan, I would like to mention that the presence on someone else's territory is not an objective in itself. But it is a means to strengthen security. In this case, it is both the security of Russia, Tajikistan and the entire CAR. Earlier a treaty was concluded between Tajikistan and Russia about joint border security patrolling. 201 Infantry Division was the second echelon to confront the threat of proliferation of terrorism from Afghanistan. Now these threats have reduced slightly. This reduction is also due to ongoing operations in Afghanistan.

Both the Russian Border Security Force personnel and in that region and the Russian personnel of 201 Infantry Brigade are being replaced by Tajik citizens on a contract basis. The Border Security Force is made up of 90 per cent Tajik nationals and de-facto, this border is being protected by Tajik citizens. Similar is the case with 2001 brigade. It has avoided moving as fast as the Border Security Force. Russia's only concern is to avoid doing things in a hurry in this region which may affect or give negative impact on the situation.

Lieutenant General VK Kapoor, PVSM (Retd)

All threats are matters of human perception. In 1986, the PLA Navy had sent a small flotilla which visited to Bangladesh, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and India. The commander of one of the missile frigates made the statement that, "Indian Ocean is not India's ocean". As is well known this has been discussed in many strategic debates thereafter. At the same time, the Commandant of China's Academy of Military Sciences is on record to say that "China will extend its naval operations further than the South and East China Seas". Whatever happens in relation to China is seen in light of the past history, the 1962 syndrome and the fact that border disputes continue. In fact, these are two competing economies located close to each other and, therefore, they would come in for competition at some time or the other in the future which could lead to awkward situations.

As far as the United States is concerned, they had a fleet in the Gulf all the time. After the war on terrorism was declared, they invited India for joint patrolling and gave certain sectors for India to patrol

independently in the Indian Ocean. However, their presence in the long run may be a destablishing factor. This is understood but you can not do anything about it. As far as China is concerned, having suffered at their

hands earlier, we do not want to put ourselves in a similar position. I am told that the Indian Navy is in a better state than the Chinese Navy. Therefore, we do not want to loose that edge.

CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS

We had a very interesting session. I just want to add a few remarks.

The first is that China is not a part of the solution. It is the part of the problem. It was China which proliferated nuclear weapons and missiles to Pakistan, and made Pakistan a centre of terrorism including terrorism in the CAR. There is no doubt that the Chinese regret some of their actions now. The Americans also encouraged Pakistan to go nuclear and they nurtured Jehadism, in order to back it against the erstwhile Soviet Union and today they are paying a price for it. The solution to the problem of stability and nation building in Central Asia and elsewhere is related to the elimination of jehadism from Pakistan and Saudi Arabia, and that requires the US involvement in its elimination. While the idea of a trilateral cooperation among Russia, India and China were first suggested by Primikov, Prime Minister of Russia, when he came to India it is the Chinese who were cold and continue to be cold. The Chinese continue to assist Pakistan in nuclear proliferation. Therefore, till the Chinese policy changes, we should have a realistic view about it. There is no doubt, it is changing and the Chinese are becoming more balanced and sensible. But they have still not reached that stage when they would make possible sincere collaboration between Russia, China and India.

Secondly, I am very happy to note that General Ostankov has a very realistic view about what is happening in Europe and the NATO. The real challenge to the United States will have to come from the European Union (EU) and not from China. In that sense, the expansion of the EU and the expansion of the NATO has been rightly pointed out are

not to be considered as a negative phenomenon. He has stated that there are proposals for the development of a European Defence Force. Ultimately, the problems of West Asia and Islamic jehadism can be solved only by closer collaboration among EU, Russia and India. We should also have a realistic assessment of the military capabilities and what can be done militarily by the United States. We have seen the mess they have created for themselves in Iraq and their inability to get out of it. Therefore, multipolar world or a world of countervailing United States will have to come by cooperation of EU, Russia and India.

While Russia has become a democratic society, China has not. Therefore, there are inbuilt instabilities about the future developments in China. That is the point to be taken into account. Therefore, I would like to close this by saying that the discussion has given us many insights. We should look at it from the point of view of the new realities of the world in which the military power is becoming less and less useful.

Remarks by the Director, USI

I would like to thank Shri K Subrahmanyam for having chaired this morning's session. For us it is a great pleasure and a privilege to have him with us. It is a long time since we had him here, because he was keeping indifferent health and I am really happy to see him in his usual good form.

For the benefit of our Russian friends, I would like to inform them that he is one of our very senior members of this Institution. He is one of the foremost defence strategists in the country.

TALK

AND COUNTERMEASURES

BY

MAJOR GENERAL OSTANKOV VLADIMIR IVANOVICH
IN CHAIR

LIEUTENANT GENERAL VK SOOD, PVSM,AVSM (RETD)

INTRODUCTION BY THE DIRECTOR

Terrorism is a phenomenon that has troubled both Russia and India. We have been dealing with it for many years. We are also dealing with it at the present moment in a deadlier form.

To chair this Session we have Lieutenant General Sood, a former Vice Chief of the Army Staff who had to deal with terrorism in the course of his duties and he has been following it over the years.

IMPACT OF TERRORISM AND COUNTERMEASURES

MAJOR GENERAL OSTANKOV VLADIMIR IVANOVICH

Terrorism has become a long-term factor of contemporary political life and a relatively stable phenomenon nowadays. The terrorist activities of persons, groups and organisations with extremist sentiments are escalating. Various forms of terrorism and extremism increasingly threaten the security of many countries and their citizens entailing tremendous political, economic and moral losses, exerting a strong psychological pressure on the people and taking the lives of civilians. Terrorist activities are getting more diverse and their nature is getting more complicated. Terrorist acts are getting more sophisticated and are gaining scale.

An important distinctive feature of contemporary terrorism is that it has become a significant factor in initiating and developing the centres of military hazard and military and political tensions in a number of regions of the world (Chechnya, Jammu and Kashmir, Sri Lanka, Afghanistan, Georgia, etc.). Contemporary terrorism can not only serve as an extension or intrinsic element but can also instigate military conflicts, in particular, ethnic conflicts, can impede peaceful process (Israel – Palestine).

The activities of international terrorists have taken a large number of human lives in Russia during the recent years. It is enough to recall the explosion in Kaspiysk (Dagestan) on 9 May 2002, when 42 people died, the hostages of Nord-Ost (Moscow) from 23 to 26 October 2002, when 129 people died, the explosion in Mozdok (Northern Ossetia) on 3 August 2003, when 60 people died, the explosion in the Moscow Metro on 6 February 2004, when 49 people died.

Unfortunately, international terrorism has also manifested itself in India many times. This was the shooting of peaceful citizens by militants of Lashkar-e-Toyba (Jammu and Kashmir) on 13 July 2002, when 27 people died, the shooting of worshippers at the Hindu temple in Gujarat on 24 September 2002, when 29 people died, car bomb explosions in Mumbai (Bombay) on 25 August 2003, when 52 people died.

The prevention of terrorism is very relevant both for Russia and India. The efforts of the corresponding authorities of both countries should be combined in this respect to eradicate this evil.

Currently it is getting increasingly obvious that the boundary between terrorism and war is disappearing. This first of all applies to the state terrorism organised by governments proper which send the performers of the acts of violence to other states, thus indirectly contributing to this. Such policies effectively are a form of undeclared low combat intensity war between sovereign states.

The difference between terrorism and other forms of political or military conflict is in using the tactics of chaotic and unlimited violence or the threat of violence in respect to particular individuals or groups of individuals who become in most cases random victims, that is, the victims who are not the direct adversaries of the terrorists.

When justifying non-targeted public terror, Osama bin Laden, the well-known international terrorist, assumes that the citizens of democratic states should be responsible for the actions of their

governments, since they elect their political leaders, pay taxes and so on. Besides, civilians can be considered as prospective soldiers or the staff of auxiliary military services.

Speaking about the roots and causes of the increasing spread of international terrorism, it is necessary to note a number of mutually interrelated factors. The leading factors being the universal globalisation trends which have affected in one way or another virtually all countries of the world, as well as the rise of unipolar world order and trends in international relations.

The outburst of terrorism in the world, especially in unstable regions, is facilitated by the state of transitional period which provides additional self-realisation capabilities to international terrorism and its underlying forces. The destruction of old global and regional international security entities which were inherent in the formerly bipolar system is accompanied by the shattering and collapse of state institutions. National, regional and international controls of the processes taking place in the world have been failing increasingly. The forces which would like to use the factor of instability and partial loss of control are trying to replace them (and are replacing them which is obvious in the example of the actions taken by the US and NATO) to accelerate the addressing of their own, mainly destructive, tasks.

The factors which objectively make fertile ground for various forms of terrorism include political and economic instability, social tensions, ethnic and confessional disagreements, etc. This process is also facilitated by the following:-

(a) The marginalisation and impoverishment of a significant share of the world's population.

- (b) The practice of using terrorist methods by individuals, groups of population and public associations as protest against infringement upon their rights and legitimate interests.
- (c) The acts of corruption and abuse by officials.
- (d) The aggravation of ethnic contradictions on the grounds of mutual territorial claims, real or alleged infringement upon the rights, social status or role of particular ethnos and the presence of steady ethnic conflict foci.
- (e) The propagation of separatist sentiments and trends.
- (f) Crime rate growth, the rising economic and financial power, armed potential of crime resulting in the claims made by criminals in respect to their share in political power.
- (g) The rising scale of arms and explosives traffic.
- (h) Uncontrolled migration and so on.

Islamic extremism and terrorism have reached a particularly large scale recently. The Islamic extremist organisations and movements which advocate the violence ideology based on "jihad" ("the sacred war") with all enemies of Islam are getting more active. In doing so, the Islamic extremists use the most hazardous forms and methods of action, including large-scale terrorist acts with a large number of casualties.

So what kind of factors have made the biggest effect on the intensification of Islamic extremism and terrorism? In this respect it is necessary to mention in the first place the "catching up" nature of the development of

Muslim states which lag behind other countries significantly in very different areas. Despite the obvious progress made by some Muslim states in their economic development, the general rate of economic development in the Islamic world is still significantly lower than in the developed countries. The population is growing faster than the gross domestic product in most Islamic countries. Their role of the commodity appendage of the West will continue for a long time. The lag is even greater in scientific and technological progress where the Islamic world is just commencing to tap (though quite rapidly) the achievements brought from outside. The generally low educational standards have a certain effect. All this causes the rising discontent in the Islamic world in respect to the impressive but still unattainable progress of the "Kafir". There is a short distance between this sentiment and the desire to harm them, including the use of terrorist methods.

A certain role is played by unresolved social and economic problems in most Asian and African countries, multiple outstanding inter-state, ethnic and confessional conflicts (the Indo-Pakistan, Arab-Israeli, Kurd, Afghan, Cyprian conflicts, etc.). The typical features of Islamic extremism include intolerance of dissent, fanaticism, the rejection of the present and the idealisation of the past.

The final aims of the Islamists are to establish the legal norms of a "genuine" Islamic state in society, to introduce the sharia norms in social and judicial practices, to restore the Islamic Caliphate which should include the countries of North Africa, Near and Middle East, some part of India, Central Asia, the Transcaucasian region, North Caucasus, a number of Russian regions located along the Volga and Ural rivers.

A new Islamic movement which is more aggressive than its predecessors entered the ring in the early 1990s. Its core was formed by the "Arab Afghans", the volunteers who fought against the erstwhile Soviet troops in Afghanistan (in all their number is estimated to be 10,000 persons from Algeria, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Yemen, Sudan and other Arab and Muslim countries). The US Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) used to spend up to 500 million US Dollars annually on their upkeep and supplies. After return from Afghanistan they were left without a clearly defined goal for further struggle and finally started actively opposing the governments of their own countries and effectively initiated a new wave of Islamic radicalism and terrorism. Moreover, "the Afghans" organised illegitimate armed units, terrorist training camps, etc. Many of them fought subsequently in Bosnia. Kosovo, Tajikistan and have fought in Chechnya and in Afghanistan supporting the Taliban and Al Qaeda.

Currently the Islamists have established a powerful propaganda machine which makes use of both traditional and the most innovative means and techniques. All these measures contribute to the appearance of new supporters of radical Islam.

Terrorist activities are characterised in contemporary conditions by the broad coverage, the absence of clearly defined state borders, links to and interaction with international terrorist centres and organisations.

A large number of professional militants, especially the veterans of various local wars and military conflicts who are ready to organise and implement terrorist acts against the citizens of any nationality for cash, which are penetrating terrorist organisations is particularly dangerous.

Terrorist organisations and groups are actively using the latest scientific and technological achievements to pursue their goals and have gained access to various information systems and, up-to-date military technologies. The range of terrorists' armaments is being constantly extended with new kinds of explosives with significant destructive power. In the opinion of experts, terrorist activities with the highest potential include:-

- (a) All varieties of air terrorism.
- (b) Shelling various targets with remotely guided projectiles.
- (c) Contaminating food products, water sources and medicines.
- (d) Using chemical and bacteriological weapons.
- (e) Broad use of all kinds of trap mines.
- (f) Cyber terrorism and environmental terrorism with their specific methods and forms of activity.
- (g) The desire to take possession of radioactive materials and nuclear weapons and using them directly or for intimidation. In this case particular hazard is presented by:-
 - (i) The threats of damaging nuclear facilities and nuclear power plants.
 - (ii) Attempts to take possession of various weapons of mass destruction.
 - (iii) Blowing up high capacity charges in public areas.
 - (iv) Possible destruction of dams, chemical plants or other activities

capable of resulting in an environmental disaster.

Computer, psychological and cyber terrorism are increasingly becoming more hazardous. It is typical of international terrorism to impose its ideas and views on peoples by gaining access to the up-to-date means of waging war, to address its ideology by enrolling youth, to say nothing of professional mercenaries. Contemporary high technology terrorism, given its constantly increasing capabilities, can cause system crisis of the world community as a whole.

A comprehensive analysis of the causes and the conditions in which it can be addressed, allows to forecast that international terrorism will get even more aggressive with increase in its structural and tactical potential and professionalism through a large-scale bold acts, better terrorist training and political terrorist entities identifying with the criminal world.

Since the tragic events of 11 September 2001, the United States, the country affected by the terrorists' blows, received moral and political support from many states and the world community as a whole. The governments of a number of countries, including the countries which are not considered democratic, condemned international terrorism and expressed their willingness to prevent it in every legitimate way possible. Both the friends and rivals of the US declared a war against terrorism after the gruesome incidents.

Russia sharply condemns international terrorism with regard to the increasing danger which it presents to the world. This is the reason why the Russian Federation definitely took the side of the world anti-terrorist coalition and provided efficient support to the US and

their allies in Afghanistan. It can be stated today that the Taliban and Al Qaeda have lost much of their power and have been scattered significantly. Pre-conditions for Afghanistan's revival have been established. The situation in Middle Asia has been relatively stabilised.

However, the results of the military operation seem to be ambivalent. The declared goal of the war, which is the elimination of Osama bin Laden, has not been achieved. Moreover, there are grounds to believe that the terrorist organisation Al Qaeda is recovering. In fact, a significant number of terrorists have not been destroyed but have got scattered in Afghan ravines, in the territory of Pakistan and other states. Therefore, the efficiency of the activities carried out by the special services of the US and other countries which cannot decapitate, and destroy Al Qaeda is questionable. Similar considerations apply to the terrorist organisations operating in the territories of Middle Asian states. On the whole, the impression is that the declared goals of war initiated by the US differ from the real ones.

The US activities have to be assessed in geopolitical terms. The US have ensured a large-scale military presence in the former Soviet Republics of Central Asia, that is, in the traditional influence zone of Russia and in proximity to the Northern borders of India.

It seems that the US has not been able to become the moral leader of the contemporary world in its fight against terrorism. This would be possible if the focus were made not on military power but on a combination of various measures differing from a response to terrorist acts and their consequences and responding to the causes of terrorism generated by regional instability and poverty. However, the US demonstrated

interest only in addressing terrorism-related issues in the military way, virtually ignoring the social, economic, financial, political and cultural roots of this phenomenon. Though most countries supported the anti-terrorist coalition, anti-Americanism seems to have increased.

It is well-known that terrorism prevention also has a domestic Russian aspect. Russia has been dealing with international terrorism at the southern perimeter of its borders for a long time. However, this struggle not only had been virtually ignored by the West before the terrorist acts in the US, but had also been used by certain political forces for weakening the geopolitical position of Russia.

The West is applying double standards in respect of Chechen separatists closely related to the militants of the Al Qaeda international terrorist group and other extremist Islamic organisations. The envoys of the Chechen terrorists were received by officials in the US and some European countries in the past.

Another aspect of international terrorism prevention should be noted. It is a known fact that one of the reasons which complicates efficient prevention of this phenomenon is territorial dispute between neighbouring states. Russia fully understands the concerns of India over the J and K issue, since territorial disagreements are playing a destabilising role in inter-state relations and provide fertile ground for international terrorism.

Contemporary international law allows the use of force against terrorists in response. The US have made use of this right more than once. In particular, when the US attacked the Al Qaeda in Afghanistan and Taliban which supported the terrorists. Turkey also

acted against the militants of Kurdish organisations in the territory of Iraq. China takes decisive steps aimed against extremists and separatists in Xinjang, China.

However, the White House seems to continue the large-scale geopolitical operation of ousting Russia from the regions of its traditional influence under the pretext of its anti terrorist operation. Middle Asia was the first region where it did so, and now it is the Trans-Caucasian region. In this way, by rewording the well-known phrase said by Voltaire, one can say that if terrorists did not exist, they would have to be invented by Washington.

It is generally accepted that the prevention of national and international terrorism is a protracted and comprehensive process. It comprises a broad range of political, military, special, financial, economic, institutional, legal and other measures. As it was mentioned, terrorism knows no state borders, and the efforts and capabilities of the civilised community as a whole should be consolidated to eradicate it on the global scale.

A new approach and model is necessary for ensuring security. It should be directed towards fight against terrorism, including military aspects. Russia in a very short time succeeded in getting valuable experience of joint measures in fight against terrorism through military cooperation in the Central-Asian region. Consultations of the Defence Ministers of Kazakhstan, Kirgyzstan, Russia, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan started on a regular basis for working on agreed measures to ensure strategic stability in the Central Asian region.

Significant steps taken to strengthen cooperation were the acceptance of the

programme on fight against international terrorism and other extremist occurrences upto 2003 in the meeting of Council of heads of member-states of the CIS countries. The document is aimed at all the Commonwealth states for conducting joint exercises annually and solving other practical problems about counteracting new threats. The programme foresees the creation of reliable agreed and legal basis of collective operations.

In October 2000 during the meeting in Bishkek a declaration of the heads of member states was prepared in connection with security threats in the Central Asian region. Once again the firm intention of the participants and members was expressed in united efforts in the fight against religious extremism and international terrorism Plan of basic measures and formation of a system of collective security from 2001-2005 was considered and confirmed here, spelling out practical measures on creation of regional and sub-regional components having a common structure of collective security. The creation (according to the heads of the member states of CIS countries) in November 2000 of the Antiterrorist Centre of Commonwealth has an important practical significance, which is operated by specialised branches of the organs meant for ensuring coordination of competent structures in the fight against international terrorism and other extremist occurrences.

New approach to ensure national security should lie in the fact that military component for government security without the set of other measures particularly social and informative in nature simply loses its meaning.

Ways for Successful Prevention of Terrorism

In our opinion, the following is

necessary for successful prevention of terrorism at the international level :-

- (a) Pursuing a coordinated policy and strategy in organising and implementing prevention of international terrorism and transnational crime.
- (b) Further development and extension of international legal framework in terrorism prevention and international cooperation.
- (c) Condemning all acts, methods and policies of terrorism as criminal unconditionally, no matter what (political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious and other) considerations are used to justify them and where and by whom they are committed.
- (d) Refusal to organise or instigate terrorist activities, preventing the use of territory for establishing terrorist bases and camps.
- (e) Detaining, legal prosecution and extradition of the terrorists who commit crimes.
- (f) Imposing various sanctions against the states which support terrorism.
- (g) Coordination and interaction between law enforcement bodies and special services in terrorism prevention, joint operative actions in other countries, including those assisted by (carried out under umbrella or on the order of) international organisations. Making special, bilateral, regional and multilateral agreements for this purpose.
- (h) Establishing national and supernational bodies to coordinate the efforts of partner countries in terrorism prevention. Formation of specialised

- anti-terrorist entities on a bilateral and multilateral basis.
- (j) The joint development of measures for opposing and identifying funding sources of terrorist organisations and isolating terrorists.
- (k) Providing assistance to foreign states in terrorism prevention.

The Role of the Armed Forces of the Two Countries in Terrorism Prevention

The key lines of cooperation between the military authorities of the two countries to prevent terrorism could be as follows:-

- (a) Gathering, analysing and exchanging the information received in respect to the status, history of and trends in the propagation of international terrorism in the territories of the countries and abroad.
- (b) Making proposals to the leaders of the countries in respect of the direction in which to develop cooperation in this area.
- (c) Participation, jointly with the interested authorities of other countries, in establishing and developing an efficient system for identifying, preventing and suppressing terrorist acts which would correspond to the current environment and terrorism development trends.
- (d) Coordinating joint activities to prevent terrorist acts at nuclear facilities, other objects of national significance, as well as to prevent terrorist acts proposed to be implemented with the use of weapons of mass destruction.

- (e) Combining efforts and resources for liquidation of terrorist organisations, illegitimate armed units, interception and elimination of illicit traffic channels for weapons, ammunition, fissile and highly toxic materials.
- (f) Participation in coordinated events for information and prevention of the development of terrorist intentions and sentiments among the public.
- (g) The joint development of technical devices for terrorism prevention, including those which (if necessary) suppress satellite communication, television, cellular wireless communication subscribers and so on.

Conclusion

It is necessary to establish effective interaction with all interested countries who support struggle against terrorism including constructive forces in the Islamic world. Russia has supported and continues to support establishing the widest possible international anti terrorism front. The logic of development of terrorism indicates to the following conclusions:-

- (a) Terror has acquired a leading role as a threat to humanity at the global level. Countering terrorism has become a dominating problem at the beginning of third millennium.
- (b) The phenomenon of terrorism will not only influence the concept and strategy of security of some countries, but it will also become a factor determining international relations.
- (c) Any isolated country will not be able to counter terrorism. Therefore, to limit the scales of international terrorism,

- joint efforts of the entire international community are required.
- (d) The fight against terrorism can only be effective if certain norms and principles are scrupuloosly followed.
- (e) Military structures in the fight against terrorism will continue to play a key role and these structures may undergo some changes in the future. Still, fight against terrorism would remain one of their main components of activities.

Thus, the world has entered the age of instability, and decreased security. Regional and international control over the process in the world fail more often. These forces are trying to take the place of the existing structures in order to pursue their own objectives which are disruptive. There are more and more shallow and empty geopolitical places especially in the sphere of power in the world. The zones of such empty spaces become centres and hub of international terrorism.

Nevertheless, so far, we have not been able to create an effective and efficient mechanism for ensuring security and fighting religious extremism.

Under these conditions, Russia, India and other countries must get their act together so that the Eurasian continent becomes a source of a secure world. The basic and major objective of Russia and India is stable peace in the continent. Nothing can replace a well coordinated fight against terrorism.

Under the present conditions, it is necessary to combine the efforts of Russia and India in the creation of a single uniform system of security in the Eurasian continent.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Colonel BB Moitra (Retd)

General Nambiar is already on the 'Blue Ribbon' panel of the UN. The panel is defining international terrorism under the auspices of the UN. Some action would be taken some day – at least some definition may be coined.

As regards military to military cooperation there should be an agreement between India and Russia for exchange of information on terrorism between the military establishments. I suggest we work out an organisation like the Interpol and organise it on similar lines.

Major General Samay Ram, UYSM, AVSM, VSM (Retd)

My question pertains to Islamic fundamentalism. We have covered various causes for it. There is one perception in the Muslim community all over the world that they are deprived and suppressed by the Western countries and their allies. This was also referred to by General Musharraf of Pakistan in his talk to the recently held conclave of India Today.

Major General Ostankov Vladimir Ivanovich

Naturally, we have to work out some clear and legal definition of terrorism from the point of view of international law. Today we interpret terrorism from our own national interests and understanding.

In my opinion if there existed a clear definition of international terrorism, the bombing by the US forces in Yugoslavia and Iraq could have been considered as acts of international terrorism.

If such a definition were in place it would have been easier for us to fight the Chechen separatists. No one would have accused us for inadequate measures. Therefore, in the present times a clear definition of terrorism would allow things to be set in order and act within legislation.

As far as Interpol type of organisation, we have an Anti Terrorist Centre in the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) which has the task of intelligence collection and exchange. My colleague Lieutenant General Klimenko Anatoly Flippovich (Retd) is an expert on this and he would do the explanation. For military cooperation we could arrange such an exchange between the scientific research bodies of our respective countries. Our organisation possesses some information and we are ready to share it with our counterparts in India dealing with international terrorism.

Lieutenant General Klimenko Anatoly Flippovich (Retd)

As far as organisation like Interpol is concerned, as mentioned by Major General Ostankov, we have an Anti Terrorism Centre in Bishket. For regional cooperation, we have got Anti Terrorism Centre in Tashkent. The objective of the centre is to monitor the situation and exchange information. This centre is a part of Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO). Since the SCO is an open organisation India can always joint it.

Major General Ostankov Vladimir Ivanovich

The second part of the question is that

the subject of fighting terrorism is widely discussed in many countries. Everywhere and all the time we emphasise the means and methods of fighting terrorism. We are fighting the results and consequences of the phenomenon of terrorism. But here we are highlighting the problem in a wider perspective. We have to fight not the results, but the cause which generate this problem.

The major cause as I had mentioned before is the marginalisation of some. Some countries become richer and richer, while some become poorer and poorer. It is time for the rich nations not to spend their funds on developing arms and sophisticated weapons but to spend funds on alleviation of poverty and social development of the underdeveloped nations.

If this problem is solved then a considerable part of the problem of terrorism would be eliminated. Of course some aspects would still remain like political and ethnic, but this is a different matter.

Chairman

We have been discussing the problem of terrorism for a long time in India in various forums such as the USI and so on. But I have never heard such a comprehensive analysis of the issue of terrorism, particularly from a global perspective. A vast canvass has been covered with a broad brush at places and at some places a fine brush has been used in analysing issues related to terrorism and countermeasures.

I personally appreciate the comment on the lack of a united global effort to fight a menace which has acquired global proportions. In that context, it is heartening to note the efforts that have been made by Russia and CIS. Some countries of the region are themselves a victim of terrorism. The joint effort like an Institution in Taskent, exchange of information, methods how to fight it and technology and so on make a comprehensive package of dealing with it.

We have been given very good suggestions and a road map of how the world needs to deal with terrorism.

THE SCOPE FOR INCREASED MILITARY TO MILITARY COOPERATION BETWEEN INDIA AND RUSSIA TO INCLUDE INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS

SECOND SESSION

Chairman

: Major General Ostankov Vladimir Ivanovich

First Paper

: Lieutenant General VK Singh, PVSM (Retd)

Second Paper

: Colonel Kovtunenko Mikhail Yurievich

CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS

MAJOR GENERAL OSTANKOV VLADIMIR IVANOVICH

The partnership relations between India and Russia are based on mutual consensus, the necessity of bilateral cooperations, and the convergence of national interests. The two have similar positions on major international issues. Since 1993, eight Indo-Russian summits have taken place. Thus during the visit of the President Yeltsin to India the friendship and cooperation treaty between Russia and India was signed and also agreement in military cooperation was arrived at. During the visit of Prime Minister Narasimha Rao to Moscow, a declaration of protection of interest of multinational states was signed. In 1998 between the governments of India and Russia a programme of military and technical cooperation till the year 2010 was signed. In October 2000 great

significance was attributed to the visit of President Putin to India. Declaration of strategic partnership between India and Russia was signed during that visit. More than 18 accords in different spheres were reached. The bilateral political dialogue was continued during the official visit of President Putin to India in December 2002. During that visit the Delhi Declaration on further strengthening of Indo-Russian partnership was signed. We can list many more measures which were taken at inter-governmental and parliamentary levels.

In our discussion today we will be talking about further military cooperation between India and Russia and will share experience on peacekeeping operations.

SECOND SESSION: FIRST PAPER

LIEUTENANT GENERAL VK SINGH, PVSM (RETD)

Introduction

Contacts between the Russians and Indian militaries have a long history dating back to the Second World War when Indian drivers drove heavy lorries all the way from Baluchistan through Iran to convey stores to Russia. Their work and devotion to duty was recognised with two of the drivers being awarded decorations by the then Soviet Union. The more recent contacts date back to the early 1960s. These contacts arose when India began to procure Russian weapon systems for all the three Services. This relationship has continued to this day. As a consequence of this supply of weapons from Russia to India, a number of Indian officers and men from all the three Services have been to Russia for training in the handling and maintenance of equipment being procured. Officers from the Indian military have also attended courses of instruction at various training establishments in Russia as have Russian officers in Indian training institutions. There have been exchanges of high-level military delegations between the two countries on more or less on annual basis throughout this 40 year period. However, these have been the contacts; the challenge is to go bevond contacts to cooperation. This paper attempts to examine some of the areas wherethere is scope for increased cooperation between the militaries of both the countries. There are four main areas where cooperation can be increased. These are:-

- (a) Cooperation in the development of military equipment.
- (b) Cooperation in combating terrorism.

- (c) Cooperation in International Peace Keeping Operations.
- (d) Joint training.

Development of Military Equipment

There is a need for India and Russia to move beyond a buyer-seller relationship to one of cooperative design, production and exploitation of equipment. This to an extent has already been recognised. The Declaration of Strategic Relationship signed by India and Russia in the year 2000 talks of 'military technical cooperation' and 'deepening service service cooperation'. An Inter-Governmental Commission on Military and Technical Cooperation has been set up under this Declaration. Working Groups to deal with 'military - technical cooperation' and 'coproduction of ships, aircraft, tanks etc.' have also been established. The objective should be-now to deepen this cooperation. One field where such cooperation could be extended is in establishing joint requirements for development of future military systems.

The Indian military is one of the oldest and largest user of Russian equipment whether on land, at sea or in the air. India has used this equipment extensively not just in training but in actual operations. This gives India a unique insight into Russian equipment, its strength and weakness. This insight is reinforced by the fact that India also uses similar equipment procured from other sources. This gives India the ability to compare Russian equipment, their design, production and utilisation strength with that of others and thus define improvements that may be required in the Russian equipment, particularly in its utilisations in hot and dry

and hot humid conditions both of which exist in India.

The Indian insight into Russian equipment combined with the undoubted Russian expertise in the design of various weapon systems provide synergies for development of future equipment which could meet the requirements of both militaries and even of other countries requiring such equipment. What is required is for the militaries to get together and decide on essential requirements to be met by any equipment required by both, for example, a future main battle tank. In other words, the Services concerned should produce a 'joint qualitative requirement', which will then become the basis for the design and development organisations of both the countries to produce a joint design and prototypes. Such prototypes would then be subjected to joint tests by both the countries leading to an accepted final design, which would then be co-produced. Such cooperative efforts by the militaries of both the countries would ensure that both obtain the best possible equipment in the most cost-effective manner. Such jointly designed equipment may also find ready buyers in large parts of Asia and Africa, which have conditions akin to India.

Counter Terrorism

Terrorism is one of the major threats facing practically all countries in the world. Terrorism affects the internal peace and stability in a country as well as it leads to tension with other countries and within the international community. Terrorism is a tool used both by certain States to push their own agenda as well by non-State actors to destabilise their own country or to strike against countries and peoples who they feel are hostile to their interests. Whatever may

be the motivation for terrorists, what is noticeable is the commonality of the means Most terrorist employed by them. organisations use suicide bombers whether on foot, or driving explosive laden vehicles, aircraft or boats to strike both economic and population targets. All terrorists are adept at the use of improvised explosive devices and use them to the good effect. All terrorists look to target State organs and buildings whether it is a Parliament or a security installation or a prison or areas where large number of population congregate such as places of worship or entertainment. There is also a common strain in the training and movement of terrorists; many of the terrorists operating in Chechneya or Jammu and Kashmir have been trained in the same camps in Afghanistan and may still be trained in the areas bordering Afghanistan and Pakistan.

Both Russia and India face major terrorist threats. Given the commonality in terrorist operations and training, the experience gained by each can be of great value to the other. A number of steps can be taken to improve cooperation in countering terrorism or at least improving the capacity of each military to combat this within their own country. The first step should be to exchange information on the method of operations by terrorists in each country because terrorists could well use the same method in both countries. The next would be to share knowledge on how each has dealt with terrorists threat in their own countries and an exchange of training notes so that each can learn from other's experience. Personnel should follow this up from Russia and India attending courses of training in each other's counter-terrorism training institutions. Information gained from interrogation of captured terrorists may be of value to the

other and should also be shared as it may help combat or prevent further terrorist strikes.

Both the Russian and Indian militaries have and continue to face and combat terrorist threats in their countries. Given the commonality of these threats, cooperation, exchange of information, knowledge and expertise would help both militaries to better combat this threat.

Yesterday General Ostankov in his talk covered the problems of counter-terrorism in great detail. He highlighted many areas of cooperation. Whatever be the motivation or nationality of the terrorist, he generally uses the same techniques. Whether it is a suicide bomber, improvised explosive device or an attack where a large crowd gathers such as an opera house or a temple. Therefore, both of us have unique experiences of dealing with terrorism. We need to exchange information of methods used by terrorists as also to train each other as to how we have used different techniques.

I want to comment on two aspects which were raised yesterday. General Ostankov had said that in his discussions with others in India he found that terrorism was graded priority three. I think that there is a misunderstanding. As far as we are concerned terrorism is an external threat as in the state of J and K. It is also an internal threat elsewhere in India. So it is not treated as a separate threat.

The other thing is that when we discuss Islamic terrorism, we need to understand that part of Islamic terrorism is caused by a struggle within Islam. One struggle is the effort to establish a truly Islamic society. But the other struggle is "within" Islamic societies to have a greater say of the people because most Islamic states have dictatorship. What happens is that religious fundamentalism and

liberals – both combine to fight authorities. Algeria is a major case. It is important for India as India lies in an arc of predominantly Islamic countries from West Coast of Africa to South East Asia. India also has the second largest Muslim population in the world. What happens in the Muslim world – affects India.

International Peace Keeping Operations

The end of the Cold War did not, as it was then believed, bring peace to the world. In fact the end of the Cold War allowed many festering discontents in the international community to come out in the open and erupt into hostilities. Contrary to the earlier phenomena of inter-state conflicts, many of the new conflicts are intra-state i.e. within the state, and where inter-state, often involve the future of ethnics groups spread across the border. While earlier, the international community would have treated such intrastate conflicts as being an internal affair of the country concerned, the growing awareness of human rights, of providing humanitarian succour and preventing the spread of such conflicts to neighbouring areas has led the international community being involved in trying to limit such conflicts and try to solve differences peacefully. International peace keeping has, therefore, changed from just deployment of lightly armed observers to enforce an agreed ceasefire or truce between the two sovereign states to trying to enforce such an agreement between the two warring factions in a state. Very often, therefore, international peace keeping is going beyond just deployment of observers to international peace enforcement which involves physical separation of warring groups, protection to threatened population, humanitarian aid workers, and, at the extreme, to forced disarmament of warring factions and the provision of a stabilisation force till such time as fresh state organs can be established.

Such operation can occur either under the aegis of the United Nations (UN) or by regional groups. Peace enforcement typically requires the deployment of much larger forces and heavier equipment.

India has a long experience not just of peace keeping but also of peace enforcement dating back to the UN operations in Congo in the early 1960s and has continued to deploy troops, including air and naval assets for such UN mandated tasks. Russia has also now got involved in such tasks particularly in the Balkans and neighbouring states such as Georgia and even further a field such as Sierra Leone.

Given the current international situation such peace keeping operations are likely to continue, including peace enforcement. Both India and Russia given their strong commitment to non-interference in the internal affairs of other states and respect for national sovereignty are likely to be more acceptable components of such forces, being seen as having no vested interests in many areas of such conflicts. For example, both Russia and India could well be more acceptable components of an international peace keeping force in Iraq compared to the Western Armies or even the Irag's immediate neighbours. A peacekeeping force with Indian and Russian composition would also have the advantage because there is commonality of equipment and the logistic support would be simpler. However, to actually be able to operate together there is, as in the case of counterterrorism, a need for exchange of information on each other's experiences and methods of operation. Information could also be exchanged on the performance of equipment and its utilisation. Both countries have used the same armoured fighting vehicles and helicopters in Sierra Leone: how each maintained and utilised its equipment and the

problem faced, if any, would be of value to both.

While there is, therefore, great scope for military cooperation in international peacekeeping, such cooperation can only be successful, if there is an understanding of each other's philosophy and method of operation in such situations. Inter-operability can only be built by joint training.

Training

As discussed earlier, there is enormous scope for military to military cooperation between India and Russia in the field of joint development and production of weapon systems, in the common struggle against terrorism and working together in international peace keeping tasks. However, for such cooperation, to really produce worthwhile results, it is essential that there is an understanding in both militaries of the other's ethos, operational philosophy, operational procedures and actual conduct of operations. There cannot be real cooperation without such understanding. Even the joint development of weapon systems has to be based on a minimum common approach towards operational utilisation.

Understanding of each other's military ethos and procedures will only come about by joint training. Such joint training must cover the whole gamut from students attending courses in training institutions of each other, to sending of observers to attend training exercises of each other, to finally participating in joint exercises. No amount of reading, discussion, or observation can really bring about an understanding of each other's operational system unless they are practically seen and worked on. Common procedures and an understanding of each other's methods of operation will be particularly necessary, if the two militaries are to cooperate in peace

keeping operations, particularly those involving the use of force. Such joint training needs to cover all the three Services i.e. the Army, the Navy and the Air Force. The Navies may well have to operate jointly to enforce an UN mandated blockade and Air Force to provide support to naval and ground forces as well as joint patrols to enforce a 'no flying zone' if so mandated. Ground forces may well be fighting along side each other to enforce peace. India already conducts joint military exercises with some countries. It is now necessary for Russia and India to conduct these in a regular manner. It is only by carrying out such joint training that military cooperation between two countries can be meaningful.

Conclusion

There is an enormous scope for increasing military to military cooperation

between Russia and India building on the already existing contacts between the two militaries. As a first step, for increasing cooperation, the paper has identified four areas. These are:-

- (a) Cooperative development of future weapon systems.
- (b) Cooperation in countering terrorism.
- (c) Cooperation in international peace keeping.
- (d) Cooperation in training.

Military cooperation will be to the advantage to both India and Russia and even though there are difficulties associated with varying operational philosophies and the language barrier, these can be and must be overcome to the benefit of both.

SECOND SESSION: SECOND PAPER

COLONEL KOVTUNENKO MIKHAIL YURIEVICH

In the beginning of 1990s local conflicts were recognised as a threat to international security. This was related to the fact that at the turn of the 20th and beginning of the 21st century, the world community faced more armed conflicts of a new generation - internal armed conflicts taking place on the frontiers. Under present conditions, local conflicts are predominant among all armed conflicts on the planet. From the year 1900 to 1941, out of 24 military conflicts, 19 were international and only five were internal. Then after the World War II, from 1945 to 1970 their proportion changed. Out of 97 military conflicts of this period only 15 were international, 26 were internal and 56 were of a mixed nature or were anti-colonial wars.

Presently, majority of the countries of the world face the same problem in areas of security, which prevailed in the period after the end of the Cold War. The chances of spreading of intra-state conflicts right upto their transformation into inter-state are high. The situation in Balkans remains unstable. The Indo-Pak dispute of intra state turning to inter state is another example. This tendency is there even in the post-Soviet era. Among the Republics of erstwhile USSR the conflicts have affected the countries of Trans-Caucasius and Central Asia, turning these regions on the Russian border unstable. These include conflicts of a latent nature (between Azerbaijan and Armenia, Georgia, Tajikistan and Moldovia) on ethnic, territorial and other basis.

The nature, conditions and form of participation of Russian Federation in operations for support and restoration of international peace and security is determined

by international legal norms, legislation of the Russian Federation, international obligations, talks and agreements. The factors determining participation of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation in peace-keeping operations are as under:-

- (a) The UN Charter.
- (b) Military doctrine of the Russian Federation.
- (c) Concept of settlement of conflicts on the territory of the member states of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS).
- (d) Law of the Russian Federation about the order granted to military personnel and civilians for participation in operations for support and restoration of international peace and security, and other documents.

Growing role of international peacekeeping as a means of solving military conflicts found its confirmation in the military doctrine of the Russian Federation accepted in the year 2000. The peacekeeping operations are considered one of the forms of using the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation. It puts the participation by the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation in peace keeping operations in the same category as their use in wars, international armed conflicts and counter-terrorist operations.

Main Tasks of the Russian Armed Forces

The main tasks of the Russian Armed Forces in peace-keeping and peace-building

operations as per the doctrine are as under:-

- (a) Separation of the warring factions.
- (b) Creating conditions for political settlement, humanitarian aid for civilians and if necessary, their evacuation from the conflict zone.
- (c) Blockade of the conflict zone in order to create conditions for executing the world community sanctions.

These tasks are executed by specially appointed subdivisions and units, who undergo special peacekeeping training on the basis of standards, procedures and recommendations of the CIS.

Principles of Operations

The military contingents of the Russian Armed Forces participating in peacekeeping operations execute their tasks under a single command governed by the following principles:-

- (a) Recognition of supremacy in supporting international peace and security.
- (b) Observance of the charter, international legislation and laws accepted by the states.
- (c) Agreement of all participants to the dispute for its settlement.
- (d) Impartiality.
- (e) Common governance and control from the side of the Security Council.
- (f) Respect of human rights, customs and traditions of the local population,

use of force as a rule for self defence against attempt of the forces hindering the execution of mandate of peacekeeping forces.

Rules for using force (weapons) by Russian military personnel, participating in peacekeeping operations, are similarly based on the principles accepted in practice - use of minimum force, selectivity, proportionality, and prevention of co-lateral damage. Our doctrinal documents do not exclude the participation by Russian military contingents in combat operations in settlement of conflicts. However, to enforce peace should be considered as an entreme mean and is allowed if authorised by the Security Council, in strict conformity with the Charter and legislation of the Russian Federation, by parliamentary approval of such a decision

Conditions of Russian Contingent Participating in Peace Keeping Operations

Participation of the Russian military contingent in peace keeping operations is based on the following conditions:-

- (a) Considering the situation as a real threat to the international peace and security by appropriate collective security organisation.
- (b) Consent of the governments and (in the case of domestic conflicts) parties to the peacekeeping operations, except in extraordinary cases (aggression) which are characterised as a real threat to the Russian security.
- (c) Strict determination of the mission mandate, operational endurance and conditions of its cessation.

- (d) Strong linkage of the mandate of peace keeping operation with tasks of furthering political process and peaceful settlement of the conflict.
- (e) Accordance by the collective security organisation which sanctions the mission, all necessary authorities to the peacekeeping force on exercise of mandate.
- (f) Representation of national contingents in peace keeping command which should be proportional to their strength and role in the peace keeping operations.
- (g) The conditions of participation by the Russian Military contingent in peace keeping operations and order given to it must be implemented in accordance with special agreements between the organs, setting up the peacekeeping force and the Russian side.

Main Criteria of Peace Keeping Operations

The main criteria for the Russian participation in peace keeping operations are as under:-

- (a) Inadmissibility of political, economic and humanitarian consequences of negligence on the part of the international community.
- (b) Timeliness of setting up of the peace keeping force.
- (c) The mission should be in Russia's national interests.
- (d) Transition to the next stage of operation after all possibilities of the previous stage are exhausted.

- (e) Availability of necessary resources and readiness of the states to contribute contingents and financing.
- (f) Minimal acceptable risk for the Russian peace keepers.

Regional and sub-regional structures must have freedom of action in responding to a crisis, taking into account the condition of Charter VIII, that is respect for the supreme role of the Security Council in issues concerning international security.

An analysis of the experience of the international peace keeping operations reveals the following:-

- (a) Peace keeping influences the development of military doctrine, reflecting new ways of using the Armed Forces.
- (b) A shift towards coercion at times takes place.
- (c) Transfer of power on settlement of regional crisis from the UN organisation to military political unions or coalition led by government leaders, bestows legitimacy and facilitates conduct of operations.
- (d) Peace keeping operations are becoming more and more complex and multi-disciplinary.
- (h) One positive fall out is that the peace keeping Operations act as catalyst for cooperation amongst states

 especially in the military and the political fields.

Problems Faced. Some of the problems faced are as under:-

- (a) Non-compatibility of control system by the national contingent within the framework of multinational forces.
- (b) Non-compatibility in staff procedures, techniques, operative standards and tactics.
- (c) The monitoring system is not fool proof. At times this leads to unleashing of local conflicts thereby reducing effectiveness of peacekeeping.
- (d) Clash of interests between the political and military aspects of the peace process.

Areas of Probable Cooperation between Russia and India

The areas of probable cooperation between Russia and India in the sphere of peace keeping operations are:-

- (a) Creating and developing of a joint system of the military and political apparatus in conflict regions.
- (b) Joint influence on the conflicting parties by diplomatic and in an emergency situation by military means with the aim of ensuring peace and stability.
- (c) Active joint support of the former parties to the conflict which are eager for an amicable solution.
- (d) Cooperation between military and civilian mission components at different levels of operations.
- (e) Improving standard of joint peace keeping forces through joint training.

Joint Monitoring of Development of Military – Political Situation

Effectiveness of the process in potential conflict regions depends on multi-level intergovernmental system of monitoring military-political situations on general geopolitical expanse. For such a system to be effective information-analytical organ and technical means of receiving information of various nations is essential.

Training of Peace Keeping Forces

Initial training of the peace keeping force would be important for success. It should include:-

- (a) Improvisation of individual training.
- (b) Conduct of command-staff training, studies and preparation for execution of complicated tasks.

As the use of multinational forces in the Balkans shows, joint training of forces must include conduct of general reconnaissance and coordination. Special attention should be paid to issues of human relations and interaction, operations in non-standard situations and rules for use of force.

Possible Mechanism of Cooperation between Russia and India in the Field of Joint Peace Keeping Operations

For success in conduct of joint peace keeping operations the following issues need to be addressed:-

(a) Conclusion of international agreements in the peace keeping sphere.

- (b) Harmonisation of international (regional) and national peace keeping laws.
- (c) Creation of integral system of monitoring regional situations and employment of peace keeping forces.
- (d) Agreement regarding the principles of material-technical and financial aspects of conduct of joint operations.

With the development and regionalisation of the peace keeping operations, there is the problem of understanding its essence. Despite conceptualisation of approach and corresponding apparatus for peace keeping within the framework of regional organisations and unions, there does not exist unified, regulated and agreed terminology of peace keeping procedures. The UN should be the apex body for authorisation of peace keeping operations, which should be properly coordinated.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Air Marshal Vinod Patney, SYSM, PVSM, AVSM, VrC (Retd)

Firstly, do I believe that Russian Government will involve themselves in peacekeeping operations only if it has the UN sanction or if it has the sanction of multinational organisations of which the affected party and Russia are both members?

Secondly, I presume Russia will continue to use the immense clout that it has in the UN to ensure that no peacekeeping and peace enforcing measures are taken without the UN sanction.

Thirdly, is Russia keen to increasingly participate in peace keeping and peace enforcing operations?

Fourthly, is Russia doing something towards the training and the special equipment that it may require for peacekeeping and peace enforcing operations? Is the problem of terrain and climate of the areas where the Russian military may need to be deployed being addressed?

Colonel Kovtunenko Mikhail Yurievich

As regards the first question, Russia as a member of the P5 favours the sanction of the UN or a regional organisation. The consequences of operations without the UN sanction are well known. Kosovo and Iraq are examples. The strike on the UN Headquarters in Bagdad was a set back. Forces which oppose foreign occupation do not discriminate between the US or the UN. My paper is not the official stand of the Russian Federation, but all operations need to be with authorisation of the UN.

As far as intervention in future peace

keeping operations is concerned, the conditions which must be met are:-

- (a) Operations must be in the interest of the country where intervention is sought.
- (b) Maintenance of peace in the region must also be in the national interest of Russia.

As regards training and equipment for peace keeping operations is concerned, this is an ongoing process as it happened in Bosnia and Kosovo. We have no specific region in the world to undertake peace keeping operations. All depends on national interests.

Major General Ostankov Vladimir Ivanovich

Russia accords a high priority to peace keeping operations for world stability. We are in the process of earmarking a peace keeping brigade.

As regards special equipment and armament, we do not have any concerns. Russian small arms, artillery equipment, armoured equipment, tanks and so on can operate in diverse climatic conditions. You all know the versatility and ruggedness of our equipment.

Lieutenant General Klimenko Anatoly Filppovich (Retd)

This is in response to what Lieutenant General VK Singh had mentioned. Possibility of joint operations between Russia and India throws up problems of compatibility of language, command and control systems, decision making and planning processes and so on.

In practice we have seen that it takes a long time. By establishing a regional centre in Central Asia we plan to reduce this problem of incompatibility. In the year 2003 a tactical level exercise of the SCO countries was held. Many lessons were learnt at the unit, squadron and company levels. For this year we have planned a collective security exercise. Observes of the SCO have been invited including Uzbekistan and China. Perhaps India should plan to send observers for such exercises.

Lieutenant General VK Singh, PVSM (Retd)

I agree with you, the first step should be to send observers. It should continue to culminate in a joint exercise. Yes, language is a problem. However, it must be noted that in the past we have carried out exercises with the French and others. Where there is a will, there is a way. These problems can be overcome. This would not happen overnight, but we must make a beginning.

Major General Samay Ram, UYSM, AVSM, VSM (Retd)

I have a question with regard to the Indo-Russian cooperation. Is there is a case for establishing a school of languages in Moscow and Delhi on reciprocal basis?

Major General Ostankov Vladimir Ivanovich

This question is very important and one of the problems for undertaking joint operations is of compatibility. It can be overcome. Colonel Kovtunenko participated in a few peace keeping operations. He is highly proficient in the English language. His proficiency in the English language allows him to successfully participate in Peacekeeping operations.

CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS

During presentations we have covered wide range of problems in military and technical cooperation. We agree with General VK Singh that development of weapons and equipment should be based on the General Staff Qualitative Requirement (GSQR) which are formulated by those military personnel who would be operating the equipment. We have a common problem with the military-industry complex. They force us to accept their technology and products and then we try to figure out, as to how to use their products.

We place terrorism in the third place only when developing weapon systems for the armed forces. Terrorism and counter-terrorism should not be put in the first place. The Armed Forces should be structured based on the requirement of defence against external threats.

In our discussions with the NATO officials we ask them as to why they give a high priority to fighting terrorism when they are developing heavy weapons and equipments which are not at all required for fighting terrorism?

Military and technical cooperation for counter-terrorism should be directed at

development of special means to locate training camps and leaders of the terrorists with high precision, to detect and neutralise explosives, means to check illegal immigration of citizens through borders and so on.

The peace keeping operations should be based on political solutions and should be conducted within legal framework. We should continuously monitor international situation and should not allow any tension in the world to spread into a large-scale conflict. Political decisions should be made very quickly. The UN is not very efficient and fast in their operations. We will discuss this aspect in the next session.

The joint training is necessary to ensure operational compatibility. Today's session may be considered as the start of jointmanship. Colonel Kovtunenko made a very comprehensive and detailed presentation on peace keeping operation's experience in Russia.

To conclude this session let me express thanks to Lieutenant General VK Singh and Colonel Kovtunenko for presenting comprehensive papers and making the discussion very interesting and meaningful.

THE CURRENT CRISIS IN THE INTERNATIONAL COLLECTIVE SECURITY MECHANISMS AND THE FUTURE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

THIRD SESSION

Chairman

Lieutenant General Satish Nambiar, PVSM, AVSM, VrC (Retd)

First Paper

Colonel Kondaratskov Igor Petrovich

Second Paper

Air Marshal Vinod Patney, SYSM, PVSM, AVSM, VrC (Retd)

CHAIRMAN'S OPENING REMARKS

LIEUTENANT GENERAL SATISH NAMBIAR, PVSM, AVSM, VrC (RETD)

At this session we are dealing with the subject "The Current Crisis in the International Collective Security Mechanisms and the Future of the United Nations". As you are all aware that the United Nations (UN) was founded after termination of the World War II. in order to save the future generations from a similar calamity. By and large, this was achieved, though there were many conflicts across the world and none of them took any global dimensions. But I think, in many ways. that was largely due to the fact that there was a balance of power between the Western and the Soviet bloc. With the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union the situation changed. The United States of America emerged as the sole superpower. The Western world in the early 1990s had a vision of a new world order controlled by them. That vision also collapsed very soon as a result of the conflicts that took place in many parts of the world in the 1990s. The Western powers tried to use the UN to their own ends but were not too successful in many cases. As we all know, particularly in the mid 1990s that led to a trend of intervention at the international level the classic case was the NATO intervention in Kosovo without the sanction of the UN Security Council. This trend climaxed with last year's invasion of Iraq by the US led coalition again without the UN Security Council authorisation.

So, since about this time last year, there had been fears firstly of a collapse of the international security system, the concept of state sovereignty, fears that the UN is dead or dying and of course, fears of the supreme arrogance of the United States of America's power. Despite these fears, my personal view of course, is that, there is still a reason to hope.

THIRD SESSION: FIRST PAPER

COLONEL KONDARATSKOV IGOR PETROVICH

INTRODUCTION

Mankind has entered the 21st century in a state of anxiety about its future. The international community has been hoping for a stable international security system, in accordance with the UN Charter. Having overcome the potential threat of global war, the world community is faced with the danger of military conflicts, based on ethnic, and religious grounds in different regions of the world.

The UN undoubtedly is still the main organ for prevention and regulation of such conflicts. Unfortunately, an analysis of development of situation in the world shows that the world order determined by the conference in Yalta and Potsdam in 1945 is undergoing a transformation – reshaping of sphere of influence among the regional centres of power with the USA striving for world dominance.

Reasons for Crisis in the International Security System and Future of the UN

First is political. The principle of monocentrism was replaced by the principle of polycentrism. New structures were created in parallel with the UN, which not only duplicated the functions of the UN, but also strived to replace, supercede and even liquidate it. This influence appears to be negative and destructive since it is built around a close circle of international players.

The emphasis appears to be shifting from collective action within the framework of UN to ensuring guarding of interests of the European Union (EU) and NATO and the USA

by way of unilateral intervention by the coalition forces under the diktat of the USA. The wars in Yugoslavia and Iraq have shown that UN was by-passed in matter of the international security process. The USA has a key role to play with some other nations realising their egocentric objectives. The UN has failed to play its role as per its charter. There is a need to restore the authority of the UN in dealing with international security affairs.

The second reason is the disintegration of the USSR and collapse of the entire system perpetuated by the "Cold War". Many nations which were traditionally inclined towards the USSR lost their beacon in the ocean of world politics. During the conference in San Fransisco, the UN Charter was formed on the principles of unanimity of permanent members of the Security Council after extensive deliberations. After the break up of the Soviet Union, there have been attacks on the principle of unanimity of permanent members of the Security Council. Its critics also resorted to different manoeuvres. specially to narrowing down the sphere of using of veto power. The principle of unanimity among permanent members of the Security Council has become a prominent international legal achievement. It provides a reasonable balance between the General Assembly and the Security Council.

The third reason is the increase in the strength of membership of the UN. It has 191 sovereign states as members. The strength of the permanent members of the Security Council continues to be five. It needs to be increased after deliberations to make it truly representative.

The fourth reason is politico-economic in nature. In the past 50 years after the creation of the UN the world has undergone serious changes. A number of countries have attained a fast rate of development. During this period the position of Germany and Japan has also changed. They have become influential and respected members of the international community and are striving to improve their status in the UN, keeping in view the important role they are playing in modern system of international relations.

Strengthening of supernational organisations such the EU and transnational corporations and non-governmental organisations are very significant causes having a destabilising influence on international security system and a deterioration in the UN's role. These conglomerates are powerful structures based on economic, commercial or ideological interests. These have a bearing on the global set up and functioning of the multinational community.

There are other players outside the framework of the UN such as diaspora having strong influence on functions of world processes and which become catalyst and source of war.

Recently, there has been a growth in the number of transnational organisations such as international terrorist organisations, criminal organisations, and so on. The UN does not have effective mechanisms for neutralising and curbing their activities which are undermining the entire system of international security.

The USA is trying to manipulate the UN system to its advantage. The objective appears to be to force the entire world to adopt their way of life and manner of conduct. Will this suit Russia, India, China, West Europe and other countries? Hardly. The prospects are that crisis in the international security system and UN's decreased role may continue for some time.

Ways of Improving the UN in the Frame of Interests of Russia and its Allies

Some ways of improving the UN in the frame of interests of Russia and its allies are as under:-

- (a) Creating of international community including CIS states and non-UNSC members.
- (b) Creating of effective system of political (international) instruments of influence on the security process in according with UN Charter.
- (c) Creating of effective system of economical (foreign economical) instruments of influence on providing of their own security.
- (d) Increasing of Russia's and Allies' influence in the international geopolitical economical, informational, social, cultural and religious spheres.
- (e) Creating of Security Providing Strategy of Russia and its Allies.

After the 11 September 2001 attacks. the operation in Afghanistan and the regime change was welcomed. However, the subsequent use of NATO in out of area operations and the increasing establishment of USA in Central Asian Republics (CAR), Pakistan et al. was viewed with some apprehension. Thereafter, the near unilateral decision to invade Iraq, in defiance of the UN, raised serious concerns on the future of the UN. Recent findings that suggest that the invasion of Iraq was being planned in 2001 itself only heightens concerns. There have been other initiatives like the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) (31 May 2003). President Bush's seven point proposal to combat nuclear proliferation whilst excusing Pakistan, China etc, and the recent support to the Sharon plan on Palestine. One fallout from the limitations of the UN, has been what Richard Haass, the US State Department Head of Policy Planning has called 'a la carte multilateralism'. Organisations like Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR), Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG), PSI, Australia Group and so on are examples of the same.

Maintenance of the status quo with changing power equations is a utopian concept. The preponderance of the US power is a fact of life and unilateralism, to some extent, should be expected. Yet there is growing dissatisfaction against perceived exploitation, double standards and a less than even playing field. Such perceptions could lead to a cascade of troubles and security concerns.

The major security issues facing the world today are terrorism in all its forms, weapons of mass destruction (WMD) proliferation, growing unilateralism, justification or lack of it for humanitarian intervention and a general sense of unrest.

The US philosophy, as per Richard Haass states "Sovereignty entails obligations. One is not to massacre your own people. Another is not to support terrorism in any way. If a Government fails to meet these obligations, then it forfeits some of the normal advantages of sovereignty, including the right to be left alone inside your own territory. Other Governments, including the US, gain the right to intervene. In the case of terrorism, this can even lead to a right of preventive, or preemptory, self defence," Many questions arise. Who will decide that the time is ripe? Will it be a collective decision? Will the court of world opinion have a veto power? There are many imponderables to contend with and it should be expected that there would always be a level of arbitrariness involved. Only a few will have the right. For instance, the US has been at pains to emphasise that India must not exercise the option against Pakistan in spite of many years of cross border terrorism.

In 1648, the Westphalian settlement in Europe recognised the sovereignty of the nation state as a basis of world order. The treaty remained valid and the bedrock of relations between states for 350 years. Now, introduction of unilateralism, excuses for external intervention, and attempts at regime change could lead to a lawless world. However, the opposing view is also valid. The UN Secretary General, Kofi Annan, once opined that "..it is not enough to denounce unilateralism, unless we also face up squarely to the concerns that make some states feel uniquely vulnerable....We must show that such concerns can and will be addressed through collective action." Many paradigms can be worked out to define terrorism and preemption. and the circumstances where preemption is acceptable, indeed essential. However, it goes without saving that such determinations

cannot be left to individual countries or groups of states. It has to be the UN that must play an authoritative role in safeguarding global security and international peace. The UN initiatives in the past and the need for the UN intervention in Iraq today prove the point. It should be recognised that unilateralism has its limits and there is a natural inevitability to move towards multilateralism in the proper meaning of the word. Also, in any multilateral organisation, some sovereignty has to be sacrificed for the common good. The point was emphatically made by President Harry Truman in the UN in 1945 when he said. "We all have to recognise—no matter how great our strength-that we must deny ourselves the license to always do as we please. No one nation, no regional group, can, or should expect, any special privileges that harms any other nation... 'That is the price that each nation will have to pay for world peace. Unless

we are willing to pay that price, no organisation for world peace can accomplish its purpose. And what a reasonable price it is."

The UN like any dynamic organisation must change with the times. UN reforms are probably long overdue. The fact is universally accepted, but now all nations, big and small, the powerful and the others, indeed the international community of nations as a body should accept that it is their bounden duty to strengthen the UN systems, and make the UN the primary agency to manage global affairs. The concept may sound somewhat utopian but it is the road to peace and security. India has always supported the UN and will always work towards giving it greater power and authority, as long as the added power is universally applied without undue loss of sovereignty.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Major General YK Gera (Retd)

My question is to Colonel Kondaratskov. With regard to the ways of improving the framework of collective security you have flagged certain measures. Do you visualise any changes in the composition of the UN Security Council? If so, what are your suggestions?

The second issue – there is a need for working out an arrangement to ensure that weapons of mass destruction (WMD) do not fall in the hands of the terrorist organisations. Do you suggest any measures to deter or discourage the states who are encouraging and supporting the terrorist organisations?

Colonel Kondaratskov Igor Petrovich

As far as the composition of the Security Council is concerned, I refer to my presentation where I mentioned that the composition of the UN Security Council should be reviewed because the situation has changed since the time the Security Council was formed. The new composition of the Security Council needs to be decided by the permanent members of the Security Council as well as the rotational members. There should be understanding among different countries. I think the members of the UN eventually would reach an understanding. Moreover, most nations have realised that unilateral use of force does not do good to the country which uses force.

As regards the proliferation of the WMD, there are a number of agreements which already exist. I believe that if existing agreements are adhered to by all members, proliferation will be checked effectively.

Major General Ashok Joshi, VSM (Retd)

Notwithstanding the views expressed by the speakers; should there not be a bottomline that unless a challenge is posed to the USA hegemony by a multipolar world order, whether by economic means or by strategic alliances, the UN would continue to flounder?

Air Marshal Vinod Patney, SYSM, PVSM, AVSM, VrC (Retd)

My comments are as under:-

- (a) I am afraid that the US superiority would remain a fact of life for many years to come.
- (b) Economic superiority or economic progress cannot make a multipolar world. Multipolarity is also not a function of regionalism. The essential ingredient of multipolarity is military strength. Japan, Germany and the European Union are economically powerful but nowhere near a multipole.
- (c) In today's age the need for diplomacy is much greater than it ever was. If the United States is being hegemonic, it is not without some vulnerabilities. Nations individually and collectively must try and see if they can take advantage of the vulnerabilities.

Major General Ostankov Vladimir Ivanovich

I would state categorically that a unipolar world would not last for long. Air Marshal Patney has mentioned those countries which are becoming poles of international politics. The EU is becoming a great counter-balance to the policy of the USA. After taking in new members the EU exceeds the USA in population, in terms of GDP and international trade.

In my paper I mentioned that the EU in order to counterbalance the USA are setting up their own armed forces. More and more contradictions are coming between the EU and the USA. In the near future, we will witness the EU reaching the same level as the USA. We must not forget that the countries in the east like Japan have great economic influence and economic power and the Armed Forces of Japan are not weak. In the near term China may reach the same level of GDP as the USA. Let us not be pessimistic about India and Russia, I think. we will be able to reach the same level as that of the USA. This may take more time. Therefore, the ground reality will lead to formation of a multipolar world.

Lieutenant General YM Bammi (Retd)

My question is for Colonel Kondaratskov. You have listed five items for creation of a new world order. Do not you think that the aims and objectives of these would clash with those of the EU and the USA specially in the UN? Therefore, instead of strengthening the UN, this process will further create rifts and weaknesses in the system?

Colonel Kondaratskov Igor Petrovich

I believe that after these steps are completed, the status of Russia and its allies in the UN will increase. As previous speakers mentioned, only the decisions taken within the framework of the UN should be made mandatory for all members. These decisions need to be well judged and then the US would be forced to take such decisions into consideration.

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, the former Soviet Socialist Republics tried to solve their problems independently. But because of the prevailing security situation, they could not make any progress in that direction. However, the process of repprochment is still on.

In case of terrorism, it is very difficult for a country to fight terrorism on its own. Joint efforts are required to combat terrorism effectively in a country.

Vice Admiral IJS Khurana, PVSM (Retd)

The creation of Confederation of Independent States is a great idea. Could the SCO be a nucleus of such a movement with added membership? I consider that there are two pre-requisites which are important:-

- (a) Russia should assume its pre-1991 status of pre-eminence to provide leadership.
- (b) Gradual resolution of problems of the Muslim world and consequent elimination of terrorism will also help.

Colonel Kondaratskov Igor Petrovich

As mentioned before, the SCO is an open organisation. Any country can become a member of this organisation. As mentioned earlier, any country can become member of the SCO. Infact, increase in members will only enhance its status. India's joining SCO will be a motivation for other countries to follow suit.

Lieutenant General Klimenko Anatoly Filippovich (Retd)

There are many judgements and controversial opinions about the SCO. One such opinion is that this organisation was conceived on the initiative of China and is

pro-Chinese in the same way as the NATO is pro-US.

During the operations in Afghanistan by the US, Kazakhastan, Kyrghistan and Uzbekistan consulted Russia before giving permission to the US for air bases. They did not refer to China. They only referred to Russia. In China, there was a realisation that no one will follow China's policy. Relations within the SCO have become more equal.

The second point is the misjudgement that the SCO was set up to counter-balance the USA. This is not quite true. It was set up as a guarantor of regional peace and security. The main issue is who is the violator of the regional peace and stability?

The third point is that the status of the SCO will be determined by the quality of its member states. If India, like China and Russia joins this organisation, then the principle of equal decision making would be implemented even more.

Another point is about the well-known Huntington's theory about the clash civilisations. We believe that if states such as Iran join the SCO, this would strike against this theory. Then we would have an

opportunity to interact closely with the Islamic world and to solve the problem not based on confrontation but based on mutual consultative basis. Therefore, one of the major principles of the SCO is transparency.

Air Marshal Vinod Patney, SYSM, PVSM, AVSM, VrC (Retd)

I hope that what the Generals and Admirals have explained is correct. But I fear that realism is being mistaken for pessimism. India wanted to join the SCO but it was not even considered by China. Japan is one of the pillars of the multipolar world. I wonder how many of us here remember that at one time in the stock exchange markets of Japan the Nikkei was at a high of 35,000. That was the time when enough money was not available in the USA and they had to take action to ensure that the Nikkei fell. This was the exercise of economic power. Was it possible to exercise this economic power without a military backing?

As regards the Huntington's theory and the clash of civilisations. When the book first came out, it exercised a lot of interest. Finally, that book was more discredited than the credit given to it earlier.

CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS

To conclude this Session, I only want to make one remark relating to General Ostankov's response to what Air Marshal Patney has said regarding the possible hegemony of the USA for many more years. I hope you are right when you say that possibly institutions and organisations like the EU, the growing emergence of Russia, China and India will be able to balance the hegemony of the USA. But as things stand today I do not share that optimism. The reason I say this is because one of the main pillars of your argument is about the growing strength of the EU as it comes together and

draws in more members. Within Europe itself, when I speak to many of the European strategists and thinkers, they themselves display an extreme sense of pessimism at the huge technological and military gap between Europe and the USA. A gap which will take some time to narrow. So in the immediate term my personal view is that, the real salvation probably lies within the US systems itself. Because I think, there will probably be checks and balances within the US system as people within the USA begin to realise that they cannot run this world alone. That again is a hope.

CLOSING REMARKS

MAJOR GENERAL OSTANKOV VLADIMIR IVANOVICH
CHIEF OF THE CENTRE FOR MILITARY AND STRATEGIC RESEARCH (CMSR)
OF THE RUSSIAN ARMED FORCES

LIEUTENANT GENERAL SATISH NAMBIAR, PVSM, AVSM, VrC (RETD)
DIRECTOR USI

CLOSING REMARKS

Major General Ostankov Vladimir Ivanovich

Please allow me to express my thanks for the joint efforts for joint work at this conference. I believe that the objectives of this conference have been achieved. We have had very open and fruitful discussions on different aspects of international and regional security and also on Indo-Russian militaryscientific cooperation. Not only was there a deep scientific analysis of current political processes in Asia but also in the presentations the prospects of future scope of our bilateral cooperation was mentioned. On the whole, high scientific potential of our organisations was shown and also our mutual and strong desire to work out a common approach on crucial issues of international security. Let me express hope for our further fruitful cooperation.

Lieutenant General Satish Nambiar, PVSM, AVSM, VrC (Retd)

On behalf of the members of the USI, let me say that what a great pleasure it has been in having this delegation from the Centre for Military and Strategic Research of the Russian General Staff for the last two days. I speak for all of us when I say that we have had a very rewarding and satisfying exchange of views on some very topical security related subjects. We look forward to sustaining this interaction and dialogue and to that end we hope to keep in touch regularly with your Institution.

While entirely endorsing the view about bilateral interaction and dialogue let me make a point in context of some of the discussions that was held in the earlier session about peacekeeping. We have a Centre for United Nations Peacekeeping under the USI which is working directly under me. This centre was established four years back and is fully functional. Besides organising training for our own contingence that are going abroad on peacekeeping missions and training our officers, we also have a number of foreign officers attending the courses that we conduct. We also have bilateral exchanges with the USA and UK and many more countries are showing interest in bilateral interaction with us on this subject. In fact, over the last two years, we have conducted a number of simulation and field exercises in cooperation with other representatives from other countries on peace operations.

If any of you had the time before you leave, the offices of the Centre are just below in the USI building. You are welcome to drop in there. In the meanwhile I have some brochures and the CD which reflect the details of the Centre which you may wish to give it to your officers and you can understand what you can achieve with us.

Finally, I would like to thank you very much again, wish you a very happy stay for the remaining period that you are in India and safe journey back.